R E P O R T   R E S U M E S

ED 017 003   72   CG 001 552

THE IDENTITY AND CULTURAL VALUES OF HIGH SCHOOL PUPILS IN ISRAEL.
BY- HERMAN, S. N.   AND OTHERS
HEBREW UNIV., JERUSALEM (ISRAEL)
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-1404   PUB DATE   67
GRANT   OEG-4-21-013
EDRS PRICE   MF-$1.00   HC-$9.92   246P.

DESCRIPTORS- *HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, *JEWS, *ETHNIC GROUPS, *STUDENT ATTITUDES, *CULTURAL INTERRELATIONSHIPS, RESEARCH PROJECTS, QUESTIONNAIRES, PERSONAL VALUES, SOCIAL VALUES, JEWISH STEREOTYPES, ISRAEL

THE USE OF ETHNIC LABELS AND THEIR MEANING TO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN ISRAEL WAS INVESTIGATED IN THREE STUDIES. THE FIRST, EMPLOYING SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL METHODOLOGY, EXAMINED STEOEOTYPES AT VARIOUS LEVELS OF ABSTRACTION. RESULTS SHOW THAT ISRAELI YOUTHS--(1) EXPERIENCE THEIR ISRAELI SUBIDENTITY AS MORE MEANINGFUL AND FAVORED THAN THEIR JEWISH SUBIDENTITY, (2) IDENTIFY WITH WESTERN-EUROPEAN CONCEPTS, (3) ALTHOUGH PREFERRING WESTERN CONCEPTS, DO NOT DISASSOCIATE THEMSELVES FROM THEIR ORIENTAL LINEAGE AND THEIR OWN COMMUNITY, AND (4) IF RELIGIOUS, IDENTIFY WITH JEWISH COMPONENTS, WHETHER WESTERN OR NOT. THE SECOND STUDY USED INTERVIEWS AND SHORT QUESTIONNAIRES TO INQUIRE INTO ATTITUDINAL IMPLICATIONS AND VALUE ASPECTS OF ETHNIC IDENTITY AMONG PUPILS IN ONE HIGH SCHOOL. IN RELATION TO IDENTITY--(1) PUPILS ARE ORIENTED TOWARD THE INTELLECTUAL GOALS OF THE SECONDARY SCHOOL, (2) TEACHERS AND PUPILS CORRESPOND CLOSELY IN MATTERS OF ETHNIC IDENTITY, (3) INFLUENCES SHAPING IDENTITY ARE THE HOME, TYPES OF SCHOOL MATERIAL, AND TEACHER ATTITUDES, AND (4) ISRAELI SUBIDENTITY IS STRONGER THAN THE JEWISH ONE. THE LAST PAPER, USING DETAILED AND STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRES, FOCUSES ON THE COMMUNAL ELEMENTS OF THE ISRAELI-JEWISH IDENTITY. MINORITY GROUP MEMBERS TEND TO BE MORE STRONGLY PREOCCUPIED WITH ETHNIC PROBLEMS AND DISPLAY MORE SOLIDARITY, ALTHOUGH THEY FIND THEIR OWN GROUP LESS ATTRACTIVE. (PS)

DOCUMENT FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR 5-1404
PA 72

ED017003

Summary

The Identity and Cultural Values of High School Pupils in Israel

S. N. Herman, J. E. Hofman and Y. Peres

Institute of Contemporary Jewry and Department of Psychology
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Cooperative Research Project OE-4-21-013

September 1, 1963 - July 31, 1967

CG 001 552

Summary of Chapter I

The Identity and Cultural Values of High School Pupils in Israel

An Overview

Background

This chapter surveys the identity-relevant opinions of a representative sample of Israeli Eleventh Graders (16-17 year age group). The data relate to self-definition, centrality, valence, overlap and consonance, presentation of self and situational variance.

Objectives

The survey findings were intended to provide a frame of reference for the three substudies of the present report (Chapters II, III and IV). They reflect some of the problems of the new emerging Israeli-Jewish identity with which the substudies deal in more detail.

Procedure

A questionnaire was administered to 3679 Israeli Eleventh Graders in 117 schools representative of government-supervised institutions of learning. The school classes were sampled on a stratified basis according to four criteria: (1) Type of school (academic, vocational etc.); (2) Religious status (secular or religious); (3) Recency of immigration; (4) Communal origin (Ashkenazic, Oriental)

Results

For the majority of subjects the Israeli subidentity is more extensive, more central and more attractive than its Jewish counterpart. For the observant minority Jewishness is at least equally treasured though the absolute level of Israeliness incurs no loss. Religiously observant subjects may be said to be more "Jewish" without at the same time being less Israeli. To them the two subidentities not only overlap extensively but are highly consonant.

Summary of Chapter II

A Semantic Differential Study of Concepts Relevant to the Ethnic Identity of Israeli High School Pupils

Background

The present study is part of a series dealing with the ethnic subregion of identity among Israeli High School Youth. Throughout the series we were confronted with two main difficulties: How does one conceptualize identity or any subregion thereof? And having conceptualized it, how does one measure it?

Objectives

The approach taken here is to define the ethnic sub-identity as a set of concepts (stereotypes) relevant to the ethnic part of the self and to employ semantic differentiation in finding answers to the following questions:

1. What are the connotative-affective meanings of such concepts?
2. What are the attitudes toward them?
3. How are these concepts ordered?

Procedure

Four semantic differentials were developed. Two of them served to estimate error variability (the complement of reliability); and two were analyzed for semantic characterization, attitudes, and distance relations among concepts. Subjects were 2110 11th graders from a representative sample of Israeli secondary schools. Questionnaires were administered in the fall of 1965.

Results

1. Israeli youth, as here represented, appears to experience its Israeli subidentity as more meaningful and more favored than its Jewish subidentity.

2. Israeli youth, in general, prefers and identifies with Western-European concepts.

3. Youth of Oriental lineage, though concurring in the general preference for Western (non-Oriental) concepts, yet does not dissociate itself from its own community.

4. Religious youth, though acknowledging the reality of a dominant Western orientation, identifies with Jewish components, whether Western or not.

Implications

1. Evidence from demographic studies has recently been quoted to forecast an Oriental trend in Israeli culture. This trend is sometimes referred to as "levantinization." The present study indicates that other forces, affective or psychological, steer Israeli youth toward identification with Western models.

2. The identities of Oriental youth, on the one hand, and religious youth, on the other, are fraught with ambivalence; latent in this are both the possibility of conflict and the opportunity for integration. If it is desired to achieve a cultural synthesis of East and West, religion and

secularity in Israel, it may be well to study, in depth, the ethnic identity of Oriental and religious young people. There is the hope of discovering, for the benefit of all, those elements of identity that reach beyond ambivalence toward unity.

3. Semantic differentiation appears to be well suited to the description of orderly relations among ethnic concepts. The fact that results are somewhat different from those of studies employing different methodology may be due to the possibility that the semantic differential taps more subtle aspects of meaning than other types of scaling. Some evidence for this is offered in Appendix B.

Summary of Chapter III

The Israeli Jewish Identity in an Israeli Secondary School

Background

The present report deals with the Israeli-Jewish identity of pupils in an Israeli secondary school and the influences perceived by teachers and pupils to be shaping it. The study is designed to follow up a country-wide survey of ethnic identity among eleventh graders. Its purpose is to add depth to the description of ethnic identity and insight into the relevant motives and channels of communication.

Procedure

Interviews taking about two hours each were conducted with several teachers in the upper grades, with a random sample of eleventh graders, and a small sociometrically determined sample of opinion leaders from all grades in the high school. A questionnaire was administered twice to more than 400 pupils in all but the first grade of the school, once at the beginning of the school year and once toward the end. A sociometric questionnaire was administered to the same population.

Interview data were content analyzed. In the present report the material was used mainly in anecdotal fashion to illustrate the school's value climate, aspects of the ethnic subidentity, and perceived influences. Questionnaire data were analyzed mainly by means and percentages. Tests of significance were applied to comparisons between grades, between test administrations, and between groups of pupils who had been exposed to varying amounts of research activity.

Conclusions

1. The principal, teachers, and pupils of the school are heavily oriented - sometimes against their better judgment - toward the intellectual goals of a secondary school. The school pays some attention to the nurture of a liberal or humanistic ideology and a mildly traditional outlook on the Jewish heritage.

2. On matters of ethnic identity there appears to be a close correspondence between the views of teachers and pupils. Jewishness is interpreted by most as a feeling, awareness, consciousness, or identification; by a minority, as an area of knowledge and intellectual commitment as well. Whether this general agreement among pupils and teachers reflects influences of the latter on the former or some common etiology is difficult to know.

3. There is a strong desire on the part of many teachers to strengthen the affective associations of Jewishness and some readiness on the part of pupils to receive the necessary experience. There is little clarity on how this should be done.

4. Among influences within the school the individual teacher, the manner in which he presents his material, and the reading he assigns appear most conspicuous. History is the most effective subject.

5. Among outside influences the home is given the greatest credit by both teachers and pupils, though pupils often have difficulty in reconstructing the precise nature of this influence. The secular youth

movements to which pupils belong do not play an important role with respect to Jewish values.

6. The Israeli subidentity is stronger than the Jewish one especially when the two are directly compared. There is some moderating effect on the difference in strength between them in that the two subidentities are highly consonant and that a large part of what was once essentially Jewish has been absorbed into the Israeli ideology.

7. With increasing age there appears to be a decline in some of the elements that are held to characterize the Jewish and Israeli subidentities. In particular, pupils tend to think of themselves less as Jews and Israelis and more as private persons. The decline is more noticeable in the elements of Jewish subidentity. Two explanations are offered, adolescent value changes and curricular content.

8. Research activity, mainly interviewing, seems to have an effect on attitudes. This effect is probably achieved by the greater salience of ethnic issues and the increase in communication resulting from it. Research activity seems to interact with the initial status of attitudes.

9. Regardless of the direction of attitude change agreement among pupils increases on almost all questions between the first and second administration of the questionnaire.

Summary of Chapter IV

Ethnic Identity and Relations among Ethnic Groups

Background and Objectives

This Chapter seeks to investigate the relation between ethnic identity and interethnic relations in Israel. The theoretic framework of the study leans heavily on the writings of Erikson (1966) and D. Miller (1963). These two investigators developed the concept of identity, and Erikson even applied it to the personal-social aspect of ethnic relations. Our study focuses on relations between Jewish communities in Israel and touches very lightly on the issue of relations between Arabs and Jews.

Procedure

The study was carried out on a sample of 675 secondary school pupils aged 16-17 and 51 of their parents. The principal measuring instrument was a highly structured questionnaire which was administered in classrooms and homes. Data were analyzed with the help of the University's I. B. M. computer. Relations among variables were estimated with the help of gamma (γ) which is a non-linear measure of association suitable to data at the ordinal level of measurement.

Results

Despite considerable heterogeneity in origin, the Jewish population in Israel can be divided into two major ethnic blocs: (a) Europeans (Ashkenazim) of European-American antecedents; (b) Orientals of Afro-Asian antecedents. The Europeans in Israel occupy the position of dominance; the Orientals, of minority status. This assertion, corroborated by the work of several investigators, is borne out again by the findings of the present study.

From a general, theoretic point of view, we found the ethnic identity of the minority differentiated from that of the majority in a number of dimensions: minority group members tend to be more strongly preoccupied with ethnic problems (centrality), and they display more solidarity. At the same time, however, minority members find their group less attractive.

Relations between the dominant and the minority group are not summetrical, the minority group evaluating the dominant group more favourably than the other way around. Also, social distance from majority to minority is greater than vice versa.

Conclusions

Beyond the present comparisons our findings have relevance to a number of conclusions from prejudice research in countries:

(a) The tendency to prejudice generalizes from one ethnic group to others.

(b) Downward mobility (or no mobility) is related to intolerant attitudes.

(c) The uniqueness of ethnic relations in Israel is in their dynamic quality. While other groups elsewhere are often assigned hereditary, ineradicable characteristics, most of the subjects questioned in the present study consider ethnic relations and all that they mean a temporary phenomenon that will disappear as the various groups become more deeply rooted in the country.

Bibliography

There are 27 references listed in the final report.

PA 72
BR-5-1404

The Identity and Cultural Values of High School Pupils in Israel

Comparative Research Project OE-4-21-013

S. N. Herman, J. E. Hofman and Y. Peres

Institute of Contemporary Jewry and Department of Psychology
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

1967

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

CG 001 552

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM T
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPI
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATIO
POSITION OR POLICY.

Table of Contents *

Page

Chapter I An Overview 1

Chapter II A Semantic Differential Study of Concepts Relevant to the Ethnic Identity of Israeli High School Pupils 16

Chapter III A Study of one Israeli High School 68

Chapter IV Relations among Ethnic Groups 153

---

* Chapters II, III and IV are each preceded by a detailed Table of Contents specific to the Chapter.

Acknowledgements

We are deeply indebted to the Cooperative Research Program of the U. S. Office of Education for the generous research grant which enabled us to undertake a project of this kind.

Our contact with the Cooperative Research Program was on a number of occasions via Dr Shlomo Tadmor, of the Israel Ministry of Education, who acts as Secretary of the Israel Advisory Board of the Cooperative Research Program, and his friendly courtesy is much appreciated.

We are grateful for the assistance received from the Hebrew University's Authority for Research and Development, and our thanks are due to its Chairman, Professor Jack Gross, and to its Director, Mr Abner Shavitsky.

The Israel Ministry of Education facilitated our access to the schools included in the study, and we extend our thanks to the former Director General of the Ministry, Dr Hanoch Rinot, and in particular to Mr J. Shochat, Deputy Director of the Ministry, who greatly assisted us in our contacts with the schools.

A team of graduate students in the Department of Psychology and Sociology gave loyal service to the project. Uri Farago and Yoel Yinon remained with us until the conclusion of the study. Associated with the study at various stages were the following students: David Katz, Ruth Katz, Hila Kutenplan, Tamar Levav, Shlomit Levy, Zippora Levy, Icek Izen and Amiram Winokur.

We had the benefit of consultation with Professor Murray Horwitz, of Boston College, and with Professor Daniel R. Miller, of the University of Michigan.

In the initial stages of the project Dr Erling O. Schild served as co-principal investigator and made a considerable contribution to the planning of the study. His association with the project ended after his departure for post-doctoral studies in the United States.

While the responsibility for the overall direction of the project rested with the principal investigator, the two co-principal investigators, Dr John Hofman and Yochanan Peres, extended the fullest cooperation in sharing in this task with him, and in addition each one undertook the implementation of specific sections of the project and eventually the writing of the relevant chapters of the report.

The project is part of a series of studies on the social psychology of contemporary Jewish life initiated in the Hebrew University's Institute of Contemporary Jewry under the general direction of Professor Moshe Davis, Head of the Institute, and of the principal investigator. The present study was conducted in cooperation with the Department of Psychology.

Jerusalem
August, 1967.

Simon N. Herman
Principal Investigator

CHAPTER I

THE ETHNIC IDENTITY AND CULTURAL VALUES OF HIGH SCHOOL PUPILS IN ISRAEL

An Overview

When the State of Israel was proclaimed close to twenty years ago the Jewish identity had a history of thousands of years. A new ethnic label now made its appearance: "Israeli". A new-old identity was born, in some ways the same old Jewishness, in other ways quite distinct. On some occasions people used the terms "Jew" and "Israeli" almost interchangeably; on others, they did not. It is the central problem of the present series of studies to clarify the use of these and related ethnic labels, mainly of what they mean when high school pupils in Israel apply them to themselves.

The first substudy, employing semantic differential methodology, examines stereotypes at various levels of abstraction, from the general ethnic (i. e. ISRAELI, JEW) to the communal specific (MOROCCAN JEW, ASHKENAZIC JEW, etc.). The second paper built around interviews and short questionnaires inquires into attitudinal implications and value aspects of ethnic identity among pupils in one particular high school. The third substudy, by detailed and structured questionnaires, focuses on the communal elements of the Israeli-Jewish identity.

The Sample - Paralleling the substudies presented in this report we surveyed the identity-relevant opinions of a sample of 3,679 Israeli Eleventh graders (16-17 year age group) in 117 schools representative of government-supervised institutions of learning. The sample was selected by drawing classes from lists of the Israel Bureau of Statistics checked against the detailed Guide to Secondary Schools published by the Israel Ministry of Education. Classes were sampled on a stratified basis according to four criteria: (1) Type of school (academic, vocational, etc.); (2) Religious status (secular or religious); (3) Recency of immigration (A school was considered to be populated by new immigrants if Bureau of Statistics records showed that more than 50 per cent of the population in the school attendance area had reached the country since 1948); (4) Communal origin (A school in which 60 per cent or more of its pupils were from families originating from Europe was considered "Ashkenazic" or "Western". This cut-off point was selected when it become clear that few secondary schools could be considered "Oriental" by choosing the 50 per cent cut-off point.)

The number of students on whom the following normative data are based, though representative of eleventh grades in government-supervised secondary schools, are fewer than the full 3,679. This is because not all of the respondents received all of the questions. (It may be noted that the subjects in the first and third studies in the present series were drawn from the same sample as that from which the normative data are taken and replied to a questionnaire which contained some of the general questions in addition to the questions specific to the substudy). There is some confidence that within the limits of valid and reliable measurement these findings may claim generality for Israel's Jewish learning youth at the 16-17 year age level.

The Dimensions of Ethnic Identity - In the present series of studies the Jewish and Israeli identities are viewed - in field theoretical terms - as subregions of the total self [1]. These subregions form objects of self-attitudes. Basic to the content of such attitudes are topological dimensions: self-definition, to mark off the relative magnitude of the two subregions, each of which may be further subdivided into communal subregions; centrality, to show their importance and interconnectedness; valence, to indicate their attractiveness; overlap and consonance, to show the degree of perceived overlap and compatibility between the parts that overlap. Other elements of these attitudes deal less with location in life space or with the vectors operating within it than with their cognitive and action tendency components. Here one may mention such variables as presentation of self, or a person's readiness to affirm his identity when it is mistaken for another; social distance from certain categories of others; solidarity, or the readiness to come to the aid of those with whom one perceives a community of fate; and others.

The normative picture to be obtained from the results of such survey may serve as a useful backdrop for the substudies in the present series. Therefore, in the sections that follow we shall review the data that deal with self-definition, centrality, valence, consonance, presentation of self, and situational variance. These are the topics most relevant to this report and will, we hope, provide a certain perspective.

Self Definition - Three seven-step continua served to measure the magnitude of the Israeli and Jewish identity relative to each other and to something called "Private Individual." Subjects were instructed to place an X "within the appropriate compartment of this scale." Below are the three continua and the percent of 1,430 subjects who placed themselves at each step:

Jewish $\underbrace{19\%:12\%:16\%}_{47\%}:19\%:\underbrace{13\%:10\%:11\%}_{34\%}$ Private Individual

Israeli $\underbrace{26\%:15\%:19\%}_{60\%}:20\%:\underbrace{9\%:\ 6\%:\ 5\%}_{20\%}$ Private Individual

Israeli $\underbrace{15\%:13\%:16\%}_{44\%}:32\%:\underbrace{8\%:\ 7\%:\ 9\%}_{24\%}$ Jewish

Let us look at the first two continua. If we think of the total self as comprising three subregions, Israeli, Jewish, and Private Person we note that the first appears the most extensive; the last, the least extensive. The neutral position that takes up about 20 per cent on either continuum may be interpreted as either ambivalence or noncommitment. The third continuum supports the impression gained from the first two. In a direct contraposition the Israeli subregion gains on the Jewish one by 44 : 24. The 32 per cent who chose the neutral region demonstrate that it is even more difficult to decide between Jewishness and Israeliness than between either of those and being a "private individual." Since it is not likely that someone remains uncommitted between being Jew or Israeli one may conclude that part of the 32 per cent constitute overlap and that for a good many among the 1,430 pupils the two are one.

There are some interesting shifts in percentages when religious preference is taken into account. On the basis of self-designation the sample was divided into observant, traditionalists, and non-observant criterion groups. 2) As anticipated, the observant were relatively more Jewish on the first and third continuum than the total sample and much more so than the non-observant group. The 47 per cent who stayed to the Jewish side on the first continuum became a full 6 per cent among the observant, and the 24 per cent on the Israeli-Jewish one became 59 per cent. To get a feeling for the great difference there is in self-definition between the observant and the non-observant it may suffice to point out that only 4 per cent among the non-observant as against 59 per cent among the observant placed themselves on the Jewish side of the Israeli-Jewish continuum. 4 per cent vs. 59 per cent dramatizes the difference in ethnic identity between those who call themselves religious (observant) and those who do not. Traditionalists occupy an intermediate position. (Tables 1, 2, 3).

Centrality – Centrality refers to the number of contacts that a region of self makes with other regions. It is, of course, open to doubt whether centrality so conceived is necessarily open to the inspection and report of the person questioned. Centrality was operationalized by the question "Does the fact that you are Jewish (Israeli) play an important part in your life?"

68 per cent considered it important to be Jews; 90 per cent, to be Israelis. As on self-definition, the observant are stronger on Jewishness than others. 98 per cent claim it to be important to be Jews. There is no difference on the Israeli subidentity between the observant and the non-observant. (Tables 4 and 5).

Valence - Valence has to do with the attractiveness of a motivational object. In the survey, attractiveness was estimated by posing the hypothetical question of whether the subject would wish to live his life over again as Jew (Israeli) in Israel or - outside of it. To be born a second time in Israel as an Israeli is all right with 81 per cent of respondents, to be born again as a Jew in Israel suits 70 per cent, but the prospect of living life over as Jews in the diaspora attracts only 54 per cent, still a majority. On this question, too, the religiously observant are more Jewish in their responses. 94 per cent would prefer to be born again as Jews in Israel and as many as 84 per cent outside of it. On the matter of reliving life as Israelis the observant do not differ from the non-observant. To be Jewish is more attractive to the religious, to be Israeli is equally attractive to all. (Tables 6, 7, 8).

Overlap and Consonance - Pupils were asked what happened to one subidentity when the other grew stronger. Would it rise, too, thus showing consonance, remain unaffected (i.e. no overlap), or grow weaker?

Among 2,980 pupils who were put this question 70 per cent feel more Israeli as the result of feeling more Jewish; 27 per cent perceive no relationship between their feeling Jewish and Israeli; only 3 per cent claim to feel less Israeli. When we consider the religiously observant we find that among 680 of them consonance reaches 83 per cent; among 1,358 non-observant subjects it drops to 62 per cent. The difference between these groups is also evident from the fact that only 15 per cent of the former, but 36 per cent among the latter see no relationship between their feelings of Jewishness and Israeliness. (Table 9).

To maintain a perspective, let us summarize survey findings for these four most basic dimensions of ethnic identity, namely, self-definition, centrality, valence, and overlap. For the majority of subjects the Israeli subidentity is more extensive, more central, and more attractive than its Jewish counterpart. For the observant minority Jewishness becomes at least equally treasured, though the absolute level of Israeliness incurs no loss. Religious subjects may be said to be more "Jewish" without at the same time being less Israeli. To them, the two subidentities are more consonant as well. It may be more than a metaphor: for those to whom religion means most the two are one.

Presentation of Self - The term was coined by E. Goffman.[3)] It refers to the front (persona) one presents as he fills a role in any one encounter with an other. We sought an answer to the question as to how a respondent thought he would behave when some hypothetical stranger he met during an imaginary trip abroad would mistake his ethnic identity.

In general, pupils appear only too ready to assert their identity. Some 90 per cent of them claim a readiness to set any one right if he mistook him for something other than a Jew or an Israeli. What makes the results more cogent is the application of Guttman's facet analysis in its newest computer-graphed version. 4) The situation in which respondents are asked to imagine themselves can be broken down into three facets (aspects). These are the religion of the person encountered, Jew or non-Jew; his nationality, Israeli or non-Israeli; and the mistake, that is, whether he takes the respondent for neither Jew nor Israeli, or only one of these. Responses may vary as to whether the respondent chooses to correct whatever mistake was made and, if so, how emphatically. The correction thus forms a fourth facet.

The three situational facets and the response facet were combined in all possible ways, thus forming 13 questions. Responses to questions were intercorrelated. The matrix of intercorrelations was graphed by the Lingoes-Guttman computer program. 5) The program plots intercorrelations between items as the smallest possible distances which will still preserve ordinal relations.

A number of conclusions can be drawn from an inspection of resulting configurations: 1. Response patterns for the Jewish and Israeli subidentities are distinctly different. 2. There is greater readiness to correct the wrong impression that the respondent is not a Jew than that he is not an Israeli. 3. Situational variance is completely overshadowed by the assertion of one's ethnic identity.

One may learn from this that respondents feel certain of their identity and will claim it whenever it goes unrecognized. In particular do they seem concerned that no mistakes are made about their being Jewish. This is of special importance when we recall that the Israeli identity is for the majority of respondents more extensive, central, and attractive. This may mean that the operationalization of self-definition, centrality, and valence was not fully successful, but also that the less certain and perhaps more sensitive aspects of one's self are in special need of affirmation, when unrecognized.

The Situation – Survey findings on the presentation of self indicated that, as measured, ethnic identity is relatively unaffected by situational variance, again as measured. This matter was tested in yet another way that led to different results.

Four historical incidents were presented in brief passages containing approximately 100 words each. The first passage dealt with the Second Temple leader Ben Yairi exhorting the remnants on the Massada Rock to choose martyrdom rather than captivity; the second, with a description of the flourishing Jewish culture during the Babylonian Exile; the third, with the dubious existence of Jews who returned to Germany after World War II; and the last, with the International Bible Quiz held in Jerusalem every three years.

Each of these passages was followed by pairs of five step scales of which one referred to the Israeli subidentity and the other to the Jewish one. The standard wording was as follows: When I read the above passage I felt 1) great pride in being an Israeli (Jew), 2) pride in being Israeli (Jew),

3) neither pride nor shame in being Israeli (Jew), 4) shame in being Israeli (Jew), 5) great shame in being Israeli (Jew). A score of _1_ indicated high valence; a score of 5, low valence. The following table shows that all but one of the means for 1,409 pupils are on the side of pride.

Subidentity		Massada	Babylon	Germany	Bible
Israeli	_M_	1.8	2.5	2.9	2.0
	_SD_	.8	.8	1.4	.8
Jewish	_M_	1.7	2.2	3.3	1.9
	_SD_	.8	.9	1.3	.8

Greatest pride is in the heroes of Massada; the least, in Jewish life in post-war Germany. It will be noted that the means for the two subidentities rise and fall together. There is in this further evidence for consonance between the Israeli and Jewish subidentities.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the situational "manipulation" we partitioned total variance into situation and person variance and applied _F_ tests to the mean squares. The magnitude of the ratios gives clear support to the situational effect, but assigns no significance to the difference between person means.

There is a slight, though non-significant, indication that subjects respond more variably as Jews than as Israelis. A non-linear measure of association shows a stronger regression of situations on persons for the Jewish subidentity (.297) than for the Israeli subidentity (.165).

This finding is in line with what has already been noted, namely that respondents respond with somewhat greater sensitivity in their role as Jews than as Israelis.

One may wonder about the strong situational effect in this series of questions when comparing it with the weak effect in the context of Presentation of Self. The simplest explanation that occurs to us is that the impact of a situation on identity depends on its type. It may not matter to respondents whether they are mistakenly identified by a Jew or a Gentile, an Israeli or a stranger; but it may make quite a difference as to whether they are asked to respond to Massada, Babylon, Germany, or a Bible Quiz. To settle the issue of what type of situational variance has an effect on identity and what types does not would require further research.

* * *

The survey findings should be seen as providing a frame of reference for the three substudies of the present report. They contain a reflection of some of the problems of the new emerging Israeli-Jewish identity with which the substudies will deal in more detail. The findings also show the relative ascendance of the Israeli subidentity among the non-observant majority and the apparent balance between the two subidentities achieved by the observant minority.

TABLES

Table 1 – Jewish-Private Individual Scale

	Observant	Traditionalist	Non-Observant
Jewish 1-3	76	46	32
Midpoint 4	15	20	20
Private 5-7	9	34	48
Total per cent	100	100	100
N	345	444	638

Table 2 – Israeli-Private Individual Scale

	Observant	Traditionalist	Non-Observant
Israeli 1-3	67	61	55
Midpoint 4	17	21	23
Private 5-7	16	18	22
Total per cent	100	100	100
N	345	451	640

Table 3 – Israeli-Jewish Scale *

	Observant	Traditionalist	Non-Observant
Israeli 1-3	8	40	68
Midpoint 4	33	36	28
Jewish 5-7	59	24	4
Total per cent	100	100	100
N	344	445	637

* The question was worded as follows: Below is a rating scale, at one end of which appears the word "Jewish" and at the other end the word "Israeli". Indicate your position on this scale by placing a checkmark X within the appropriate compartment on this scale. To the extent that the mark is nearer to "Israeli" it means that you feel yourself so much more Israeli than Jewish. To the extent that the mark X is nearer to "Jewish" it means that you feel yourself so much more Jewish. Please note that the mark X should be placed inside the space between the points on the scale.

Israeli :___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Jewish"
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Table 4 – Centrality of Jewishness

"Does the fact that you are Jewish play an important part in your life?"

	All Respondents	Observant	Traditionalist	Non-Observant
1. It plays a very important part	23	62	18	7
2. It plays an important part	45	36	60	39
3. It is of little importance	25	1	18	44
4. It plays no part	7	1	4	10
Total per cent	100	100	100	100
N	2980	680	942	1358

Table 5 – Centrality of Israeliness

"Does the fact that you are Israeli play an important part in your life?"

	All Respondents	Observant	Traditionalist	Non-Observant
1. It plays a very important part	43	44	43	42
2. It plays an important part	47	48	49	48
3. It is of little importance	7	5	5	8
4. It plays no part	3	3	2	2
Total per cent	100	100	100	100
N	2980	680	942	1358

Table 6 – Valence of Jewishness

"If you were to be born all over again, would you wish to be born a Jew?"

	All Respondents	Observant	Traditionalist	Non-Observant
1. Yes	70	94	76	54
2. It makes no difference to me	28	6	23	43
3. No	2	-	1	3
Total per cent	100	100	100	100
N	2980	680	942	1358

Table 7 - Valence of Jewishness (in life abroad)

"If you were to live abroad, would you wish to be born a Jew?"

	All Respondents	Observant	Traditionalist	Non-Observant
1. Yes	54	84	57	37
2. It makes no difference to me	25	8	23	34
3. No	21	8	20	29
Total per cent	100	100	100	100
N	2980	680	942	1358

Table 8 - Valence of Israeliness

"If you were to be born again, would you wish to be born an Israeli?

	All Respondents	Observant	Traditionalist	Non-Observant
1. Yes	81	79	78	82
2. It makes no difference to me	17	17	18	17
3. No	2	4	4	-
Total per cent	100	100	100	100
N	2980	680	942	1358

Table 9 - Overlap and Consonance

When I feel more Jewish:

	All Respondents	Observant	Traditionalist	Non-Observant
1. I also feel more Israeli	70	83	76	62
2. There is no relationship between my feeling Jewish and my feeling Israeli	27	15	22	36
3. I feel less Israeli	3	2	2	2
Total per cent	100	100	100	100
N	2980	680	942	1358

Notes

1) K. Lewin: Field Theory in Social Science (ed. D. Cartwright). Harper, N. Y. 1951.

2) "Observant" (Hebrew "dati") implies a strict observance of religious obligations; "traditionalist" (Hebrew "mesorati") implies a positive orientation to Jewish tradition associated with varying degrees of laxity and selectivity in regard to observance; the "non-observant" (Hebrew "lo-dati") category ranges from those who honor a few of the religious customs to those who are anti-religious.

3) E. Goffman: The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959.

4) L. Guttman: "A General Non-metric Technique for Finding the Smallest Euclidean Space for Configuration of Points, "Due to appear in Psychometrika, (1967), also,

– : "A Structural Theory for Inter and Action," American Sociological Review, XXIV (1959), 318-28.

5) J. Lingoes: "An I. B. M. -7090 Program of Guttman-Lingoes Smallest Space Analysis," Behavioral Science, X (1965), 183-84.

CHAPTER II

A SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL STUDY OF CONCEPTS RELEVANT TO THE ETHNIC SUBIDENTITY OF ISRAELI HIGH SCHOOL PUPILS

John E. Hofman
Haifa College of
The Hebrew University, Jerusalem

LIST OF CONTENTS

Page

PROBLEM AND METHOD 18

The Development of the Semantic Differentials of Ethnic Concepts 18 18

1. Semantic differential technique 18
2. Developmental problems 19
3. Choice of concepts 20
4. Choice of adjective pairs 22
5. The instruments 23
6. The samples 24
7. Validity 24
8. Reliability 25

FINDINGS 31

Semantic characterization of Ethnic and Communal Concepts 31

1. Ethnic Concepts: Total Group 31
2. Ethnic Concepts: Oriental and European Criterion Groups 34
3. Ethnic Concepts: Religious and non-religious Criterion Groups 36
4. Communal Concepts: Total Group 37
5. Communal Concepts: Oriental and European Criterion Groups 40

Ethnic and Communal Attitudes 40

1. Measurement 40
2. Results 42

Configuration of Concepts 45
1. Measurement 45
2. Configuration of national concepts 45
3. Configuration of communal concepts 50

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION 55

Appendix A 59

" B 60

Notes 64

Bibliography 66

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Reliability of Semantic Characterizations: 5 Ethnic Concepts	26
2	Reliability of Semantic Characterizations: 5 Communal Concepts	28
3	Reliability of Semantic Differentials	29
4	Mean Scale Values of Ethnic Concepts	32
5	Ethnic Concepts: Oriental and European Subjects	35
6	Mean Scale Values of Ethnic Concepts: Religious and Non-religious Subjects	37
7	Mean Scale Values of Communal Concepts	38
8	Communal Concepts	41
9	Attitudes toward Ethnic and Communal Concepts	43
10	The Rank Order of Eleven Concepts by pair comparison and Semantic Differential	62

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Ethnic Concepts. Interconcept Distances: National Sample	47
2	Ethnic Concepts. Interconcept Distances: Religious and non-Religious Samples	49
3	Communal Concepts. Interconcept Distances: National Sample	51
4	Communal Concepts. Interconcept Distances: Oriental and European Samples	53

PROBLEM AND METHOD

How do Israeli youth perceive, evaluate and order concepts that have to do with their ethnic identity? This was the basic problem to which the present investigation addressed itself. One technique appropriate to its exploration seemed the semantic differential. 1) We shall discuss four aspects of the investigation: first, the development of particular forms of the semantic differential; second, the characterization of concepts by means of the differentials; third, the measurement of attitudes through the evaluative scales; and, finally, the distance relations among concepts. We shall endeavor to show that the semantic differential technique fulfilled, to a large degree, the hopes that were placed in it; the results display a degree of internal consistency and structure that speak for validity.

The Development of the Semantic Differentials of Ethnic Concepts

1. Semantic differential technique. The semantic differential is a technique for measuring the connotative or affective meaning of concepts by rating them on a set of bipolar adjective scales selected to represent a hypothetical multi-dimensional space, called semantic space. The measurement of such meaning subsumes three related objectives: (i) the characterization of concepts; (ii) the measurement of attitudes toward these concepts; and, by further elaboration, (iii) the allocation of

concepts to points in semantic space. All three objectives can be accomplished either for individuals each of whom displays idiosyncratic ways of indexing meaning or for groups of individuals. An important assumption underlying the theory of semantic differentiation is that similarity of affective meaning represents or mediates psychological affinity. That is, the closer two concepts in meaning, the greater the relationship between them.

2. Developmental problems. The application of the semantic differential technique involves a choice of concepts and a choice of adjective pairs or scales. Selecting concepts is mainly a "conceptual" problem inherent in the research objectives. The selection of adjective pairs is more of an empirical problem: such pairs must be found as will maximize differentiation among the concepts to be used. It is felt by some that the problem of adjective scales was settled when three major factors were identified by Osgood and his colleagues. This impression was reinforced by the appearance of a "semantic atlas." 2) Actually, the three major semantic factors that appeared in these studies may be expected to appear only with large heterogeneous samples of concepts. Osgood himself wrote that there is

> no such entity as 'The Semantic Differential', with a rigidly defined set of factors – except perhaps in the sense of a common denominator from which more specific instruments are to be derived. 3)

Moss, in reviewing semantic differential research, pointed to the need for the development of different semantic differentials for different classes of concepts. 4) The same point was made again by Osgood, Ware and Morris, 5) after whom large parts of this study are modeled, and by Husek and Wittrock. 6) The following two sections will delineate some of the considerations in the choice of concepts and adjective pairs.

3. Choice of concepts. In the present study concepts were to represent some of the major foci of identity available to Israeli Jewish youth: Jew - Non-Jew, Israeli - Non-Israeli, European (Ashkenazic) - Oriental (Sephardic in the main), Diaspora - Israel, among others. To "cover" these foci, four instruments of differentiation were developed, two of which contained "ethnic" concepts and two of which contained "communal" concepts. The semantic differentials of "ethnic" concepts were called SDE-I and SDE-II; those of "communal" concepts, SDC-I and SDC-II. Of course, "ethnic" and "communal" represent arbitrary ad-hoc distinctions.

The number of concepts had to be minimized so as to prevent an undue burden on the youthful respondents, especially since the semantic differential was a mere part of a larger questionnaire.

Also, a decision had to be made between the several possible forms of "self:" ME AS I AM, ME AS OTHERS SEE ME, ME AS I WISH TO BE, because all of them would unbalance the set of concepts. The matter was resolved by pretests which showed that ME alone would be sufficient, that any more than that was not enough of an analytic gain to offset the unwieldiness of all three. ME AS I WISH TO BE, moreover, runs into useless "ceiling effects." 7) ME AS OTHERS SEE ME turns out to be very much like ME AS I AM with groups of people. Hence, it was to be ME on SDE-I and SDE-II and ME AS I AM on SDC-I and SDC-II.

A further problem was the matter of concept "locale." It had to be clear to respondents whether AMERICAN JEW, for example, was someone in America or in Israel; JEW IN AMERICA was chosen because that was the least ambiguous formulation. Only when a high level of generality was wanted did we settle on something like JEW. After four pretests and many deliberations the following concepts were chosen:

Ethnic Concepts:		Communal Concepts	
SDE-I	SDE-II	SDC-I	SDC-II
Me	Me	Typical Israeli	Typical Israeli
Israeli	Israeli	Yemenite Jew	Sephardic Jew
Jew	Jew	Moroccan Jew	Yemenite Jew
Jew in America	Jew in Poland	Ashkenazic Jew	Ashkenazic Jew
American non Jew	Polish non Jew		Arab
Israeli Arab	Israeli Arab		One of my own ethnic group
Jew from Abroad	Jew from Abroad		Me as I am
			Ideal person

The concepts are listed above in the order of their presentation to respondents. It should be remembered that they, as well as the adjective pairs of the next section, are translations from Hebrew. A technique that builds on affective and connotative meaning is of course sensitive to translation; the reader should keep this in mind when interpreting research findings.

4. Choice of adjective pairs. It has been mentioned that the measurement of connotative-affective meaning aims at the semantic characterization of concepts, and – via such characterizations – at their allocation in semantic space. Both these objectives would seem to call for adjective pairs that (a) maximally differentiate a set of concepts, and (b) minimally correlate with one another. This is because distance measures in semantic space are summed over differences on adjective pairs; the more varied the aspects of meaning elicited by the various adjective pairs the more complete the possibility of differentiation in semantic space.

It will become apparent that these criteria were only incompletely realized. Two reasons may account for this partial failure: one, adjective pairs were construed as evaluative (good-bad) by respondents even where it was hoped that more subtle dimensions would be tapped; and two, concessions were made to an attempt at covering the dimensions of the original Osgood study by using the scales of adjective pairs that had been useful then. Still, with these reservations, the adjective pairs chosen after the four pretests served rather well:

SDE-I and SDE-II		SDC-I and SDC-II	
Unsociable	- Sociable	Sociable	- Unsociable
Lazy	- Industrious	Lazy	- Industrious
Unpleasant	- Pleasant	Unpleasant	- Pleasant
Strong	- Weak	Strong	- Weak
Obstinate	- Yielding	Strict	- Lenient
Practical	- Unpractical	Practical	- Unpractical
Conservative	- Progressive	Traditional	- Progressive
Dishonest	- Honest	Temperamental	- Moderate
Free	- Constrained	Free	- Constrained
Clever	- Not clever	Clever	- Not clever
Ugly	- Beautiful	Ugly	- Beautiful
Cold	- Warm	Cold	- Warm

The differences between the two lists are minor so that comparisons are justified. These particular adjective pairs were retained because they discriminated between concepts, had a certain descriptive relevance (at the expense of more affective-connotative subtlety, perhaps) and seemed to cover Osgood's major semantic factors.

5. Instruments. Seven-step forms of the semantic differential were used throughout. Order and direction of adjective pairs were randomized as may be seen above. Scale values were taken from left to right, from 1 to 7. Instructions to subjects were adapted from standard instructions and modified to suit the comprehension of respondents. A translation of the instructions and a sample page are offered in Appendix A.

6. The samples. The four semantic differentials were administered to independent samples in the winter of 1965. 2110 pupils in the eleventh grades of a national sample of schools returned scorable questionnaires. The schools represented every type of secondary education and were chosen at random. The distribution of the 2110 subjects among the four differentials was as follows:

SDE-I	749 Pupils
SDE-II	743 Pupils
SDC-I	332 Pupils
SDC-II	286 Pupils
Total	2110 Pupils

7. Validity. The aim of this study is an exploration of the manner in which ethnic and communal concepts are perceived, evaluated and ordered by high school youth. Measures are valid to the extent that they accord with other evidence and yield a meaningful pattern. Closest to these criteria is the notion of construct validity which concerns the "analysis of the meaning of test scores in terms of psychological constructs." 8)

The "psychological construct" of this study is the ethnic subidentity of 11th graders. Criterial elements of this construct are such concepts as JEW, ISRAELI, YEMENITE JEW, and ARAB. The semantic differential probes the affective-connotative meaning of these elements, attitudes toward them, and relations among them. Whether it succeeds will have to be judged in the light of the theoretical formulations advanced by workers in the field of ethnic identity,[9] of the reasonableness of results reported in this study, and of further research; for "construct validity is established through a long continued interplay between observation, reasoning and imagination."[10] Appendix B reports findings from one of the pretests in which eleven concepts were scaled by pair comparison[11] and rated on a semantic differential by the same Israeli University students. Pair comparison resulted in ranks that placed all the Jewish concepts ahead of non-Jewish ones thus conforming to the point of view sanctioned by the wider society. Semantic differentiation showed a preference for non-traditional Western concepts as one might expect from secular Israelis off their guard. It would seem that the semantic differential measures what it purports to measure, namely affective-connotative meaning. In the context of the present study this holds out hope at access to the more recondite corners of self.

8. Reliability. Reliability has to do with the stability of scores. If concept scores on the various adjective scales are stable measures of some attribute, results for different samples drawn from the same population should be comparable within random variations. The distribution of discrepancies between mean values for the same concept on the same adjective continuum in equivalent samples provides a direct estimate of error fluctuation, hence of reliability.

In Table 1, mean scale values for five concepts that appear in both SDE-I and SDE-II have been juxtaposed. For example, ME appears on

TABLE 1

Reliability of Semantic Characterizations

Mean Scale Values of Same 5 Ethnic Concepts on Two National Samples

(N_1 = 749; N_2 = 743)

Scales	ME		ISRAELI		JEW FROM ABROAD		JEW		ISRAELI ARAB		Opposites
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	
Not sociable	5.77[a]	5.75	5.84	5.86	5.08	5.16	4.98	5.05	4.06	4.33	Sociable
Lazy	5.03	4.91	5.45	5.45	5.13	5.10	5.39	5.38	4.59	4.57	Industrious
Unpleasant	5.63	5.55	5.48	5.44	5.18	5.27	5.10	5.08	3.72	3.81	Pleasant
Strong	3.31	3.25	2.61	2.60	4.14	4.20	4.13	4.09	3.12	3.14	Weak
Obstinate	3.86	3.77	3.02	2.94	4.14	4.17	3.61	3.71	3.16	3.37	Yielding
Practical	2.46	2.45	2.30	2.36	3.26	3.23	3.15	3.05	3.77	3.86	Impractical
Conservative	5.54	5.57	5.79	5.85	4.54	4.83	3.45	3.54	3.16	3.75	Progressive
Dishonest	6.15	6.08	5.24	5.35	4.98	4.87	5.14	5.08	3.61	3.58	Honest
Free	2.90	2.94	2.34	2.31	4.27	3.99	4.31	4.33	4.56	4.41	Constrained
Shrewd	2.47	2.48	2.39	2.44	2.63	2.58	2.08	2.05	4.37	4.36	Not shrewd
Ugly	4.88	4.90	5.07	5.15	4.54	4.65	4.38	4.49	3.41	3.55	Beautiful
Cold	4.95	4.95	5.10	5.21	4.43	4.36	4.58	4.61	4.87	4.97	Warm

[a] For Values < 4.0 the mean judgement is toward the left-hand term; for Values > 4.0, toward the right-hand term.

both SDE-I and SDE-II which were administered to 749 and 743 subjects respectively. Since the two samples are drawn from the same population mean values should be quite similar. And, in fact, the largest discrepancy between the two ME'S is of the magnitude 5.03 minus 4.91 equals .12, on the lazy-industrious continuum. The largest absolute difference (.27) is for ISRAELI ARAB on the not-sociable-sociable scale. Random variation is smallest for ME and ISRAELI, intermediate for JEW FROM ABROAD and JEW, largest for ISRAELI ARAB. Possibly the concepts closest to self elicit the greatest unanimity. A second possibility is that the more highly abstract concept is the most agreed upon. The evidence will be weighed again in the light of further findings. It is certainly of theoretical interest whether agreement on the meaning of a concept is a function of psychological proximity to self or of some other variable.

Table 2 contains 4 communal concepts common to SDC-I and SDC-II. It will be noted that here the variability of discrepancies is greater than on ethnic concepts. The most plausible reason for this is in the much smaller samples, but some factor inhering in the concepts themselves cannot be ruled out. It might, for example, be argued that the communal concepts are at a somewhat lower, more particular level of abstraction than the ethnic ones. This, of course, lends some support to the level-of-abstraction argument as an explanation for unanimity.

Table 3 reports the distribution of differences between mean values of the same concepts on the same scales. Distributions are listed

TABLE 2

Reliability of Semantic Characterizations

Mean Scale Values of Same 5 Communal Concepts on Two National Samples

(N_1 = 332; N_2 = 286)

Scales	TYPICAL ISRAELI		ASHKENAZIC JEW		IDEAL PERSON		YEMENITE JEW		MOROCCAN JEW		Opposites
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	
Sociable	2.15[a]	2.28	2.94	2.87	1.57	1.59	2.34	2.55	3.57	3.81	Not sociable
Lazy	5.25	5.37	5.11	4.98	6.44	6.59	5.75	5.97	4.34	4.35	Industrious
Unpleasant	5.65	5.49	5.52	5.40	6.64	6.67	5.33	5.35	4.27	4.18	Pleasant
Strong	2.40	2.62	3.73	3.79	2.15	2.12	3.10	3.49	2.27	2.40	Weak
Strict	4.09	3.89	3.46	3.69	4.51	4.44	3.96	4.15	2.90	3.05	Lenient
Practical	2.17	2.42	2.66	2.75	1.56	1.53	2.77	2.62	3.36	3.55	Impractical
Traditional	5.37	5.35	5.23	5.27	5.05	5.28	2.15	2.56	3.51	3.50	Progressive
Temperamental	3.72	3.86	5.01	5.06	5.19	5.17	3.88	4.42	2.21	2.22	Moderate
Free	1.91	2.11	3.16	3.01	2.66	2.72	4.34	4.20	2.89	3.03	Constrained
Shrewd	2.05	2.17	2.24	2.21	1.45	1.45	2.99	2.88	3.49	3.46	Not shrewd
Ugly	5.20	5.19	5.34	5.37	5.93	5.88	3.94	4.00	4.60	4.64	Beautiful
Cold	5.08	4.87	4.20	3.79	4.87	4.24	4.75	4.38	5.34	5.49	Warm

[a] For Values < 4.0, the mean judgement is toward the left-hand term; for Values > 4.0, toward the right-hand term.

TABLE 3

Reliability of Semantic Differentials

Distribution of Differences Between Mean Values of Same Ethnic and Communal Concepts

Magnitude of Differences between Mean Values	5 Ethnic Concepts f[a]	5 Communal Concepts f[b]
.40 - .49	0	2
.30 - .39	0	1
.20 - .29	1	2
.10 - .19	4	6
.00 - .09	23	12
.10 - .01	24	15
.20 - .11	5	13
.30 - .21	3	6
.40 - .31	0	1
.50 - .41	0	1
.60 - .51	0	1

[a] Differences in same direction: SDE-I - SDE-II.

[b] " " " " : SDC-I - SDC-II.

separately for SDE-I and II and for SDC-I and II. The greater variability of "error" discrepancies on SDC differentials is immediately obvious. Putting it differently, confidence intervals are narrower on SDE instruments. We learn that 46 out of 60 differences between mean values on SDE-I and SDE-II do not exceed 1/10 of a scale unit, about 95 % do not exceed 1/4, and no differences are larger than .30.

Since criterion groups are smaller than total samples and require a larger margin of error, it was decided to regard differences of half a scale unit as reliable on SDE differentials. On SDC the greater variability of discrepancies led to the adoption of .75 as a reliable difference in creterion group comparisons.

The present procedure of estimating reliable differences departs from the usual one of basing estimates of reliability and confidence intervals on self-correlation. It is argued in defense that the stability of scores is demonstrated from equivalent samples and that error variance is taken into account. If anything, the present procedure is more conservative than that of self-correlation. It is similar, in principle, to that employed by Osgood and his associates. 12)

FINDINGS

Semantic Characterization of Ethnic and Communal Concepts

1. Ethnic concepts: Total Group. How did eleventh graders perceive the seven ethnic concepts? How did they rate them on the 12 adjective scales? To answer this question, results from SDE-I are reported in Tables 4, 5 and 6. SDE-II was not used for this purpose, partly because findings were about the same, and partly because POLISH NON-JEW and JEW IN POLAND proved to be poorly differentiated concepts.

Table 4 lists mean scale values for the sample of 749 pupils from a random sample of secondary schools. Adjective pairs appear in the order of their presentation both from top to bottom and from left to right. Values below 4.00 express the judgement to the left hand side; those above 4.00, to the right hand characterization. The order in which concepts are arranged follows computations of distance from ME, as will be explained below.

Departures of mean values from neutral (4.0) by at least one scale unit are considered sufficiently polarized to be "meaningful." This would seem to contradict the previous decision concerning reliable intervals, but we are now dealing with departures from neutral and not with differences between criterion groups. A "meaningful" departure from neutral should be large enough in a substantive sense, not merely significant or reliable in a statistical one.[13)] Mean scores below 3.00 or above 5.00 are

TABLE 4

Mean Scale Values of Ethnic Concepts

National Sample N = 749

Scales	ME	ISRAELI	AMERICAN NON-JEW	JEW IN AMERICA	JEW FROM ABROAD	JEW	ISRAEL JEW	Opposites
Not sociable	5.77[ab]	5.84[b]	5.36[b]	5.27[b]	5.08[b]	4.98	4.06	Sociable
Lazy	5.03[b]	5.45[b]	5.07[b]	5.12[b]	5.13[b]	5.39[b]	4.59	Industrious
Unpleasant	5.63[b]	5.48[b]	5.27[b]	5.26[b]	5.18[b]	5.10[b]	3.72	Pleasant
Strong	3.31	2.61[b]	3.30	3.73	4.14	4.13	3.12	Weak
Obstinate	3.86	3.02	3.96	4.01	4.14	3.61	3.16	Yielding
Practical	2.46[b]	2.30[b]	2.93[b]	2.94[b]	3.26	3.15	3.77	Unpractical
Conservative	5.54[b]	5.79[b]	5.92[b]	5.66[b]	4.54	3.45	3.16	Progressive
Dishonest	6.15[b]	5.24[b]	4.66	4.82	4.98	5.14[b]	3.61	Honest
Free	2.90[b]	2.34[b]	2.31[b]	3.03	4.27	4.31	4.56	Constrained
Shrewd	2.47[b]	2.39[b]	3.01	2.66[b]	2.63[b]	2.08[b]	4.37	Not shrewd
Ugly	4.88	5.07[b]	4.98	4.81	4.54	4.38	3.41	Beautiful
Cold	4.95	5.10[b]	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.58	4.87	Warm

a For values <4.0 the mean judgement is toward the left hand term: For values > 4.0, toward the right hand term.

b Values departing from 4.0 (neutral) by at least one scale value: defined as "meaningful" characterizations.

therefore "meaningful" and are identified by a raised b. Mean scores between 3.00 and 5.00 represent the scatter of individual scores along the continuum or the concentration of individual scores in the neutral zone. That is, they reflect either lack of agreement or agreement on meaninglessness. Evidence will not be furnished on this point, but experience and the inspection of tally marks shows that in the large majority of instances we are dealing with lack of agreement, that is with a wide scatter of scores on both sides of the continuum, rather than with agreement on no-meaning.

Having operationalized the notion of meaningfulness, we may proceed with characterizations: ME, as an example, is sociable, industrious, pleasant, practical, progressive, honest, free, and shrewd. There is no agreement on strong-weak, obstinate-yielding, ugly-beautiful, cold-warm. ISRAELI is all that ME is, but strong, beautiful, and warm as well. These last three attributes are unhesitatingly applied to a valued group, but not always to the self. AMERICAN NON-JEW and JEW IN AMERICA both are sociable, industrious, pleasant, practical, and progressive, but where the AMERICAN NON-JEW is free his Jewish countryman is shrewd. We have here a bit of Zionist ideology: if the Jew wants to be free and yet continue to be shrewd he need merely come to Israel; ISRAELI is free AND shrewd. JEW FROM ABROAD and JEW are similar to JEW IN AMERICA, but less progressive. There is no agreement on ISRAELI ARAB judging from the middling values.

Scanning the columns of Table 4 as a whole one notes that mean judgement becomes less polarized as one proceeds from concepts closest to ME to those farther away. In this instance "psychological" distance is the most obvious correlate of meaningfulness. Surveying the rows we note that almost everybody is sociable, industrious and pleasant and almost nobody is strong, weak, obstinate, yielding, warm, or cold. The most discriminating scales are practical-unpractical, free-constrained, conservative-progressive, and shrewd-not shrewd.

2. Ethnic concepts: Oriental and European criterion groups. Do Oriental youth in our sample evaluate the national concepts differently from their Ashkenazic peers? Table 5 reports the mean judgements on 175 Oriental and 557 Ashkenazic subjects. The separation into criterion groups is based on self-report.

No more than six differences reached the magnitude of 1/2 scale unit. Six "significant" differences among 84 possible ones may be a chance outcome. Apparently these concepts are not sufficiently critical with respect to communal differences to elicit discrepancies. Also, pupils exposed to the greater part of a secondary education may no longer differ in perceptions that are the continuous object of education. One should not generalize from these results to the Oriental and European communities at large, because for the country as a whole they differ widely in educational level.

TABLE 5

Ethnic Concepts

Oriental (N = 175) and European (N = 557) Subjects

Scales	ME		ISRAELI		AMERICAN NON JEW		JEW IN AMERICA		JEW FROM ABROAD		JEW		ISRAEL ARAB		Opposites
	S[a]	A[b]	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	
Not sociable	5.95	5.70	5.94	5.83	5.50	5.33	5.37	5.25	5.33	5.00	5.07	4.94	3.87	4.10	Sociable
Lazy	5.31	4.94	5.65	5.37	5.29	5.02	5.35	5.04	5.34	5.06	5.81 >	5.27	4.66	4.58	Industrious
Unpleasant	5.82	5.37	5.61	5.44	5.51	5.19	5.62	5.13	5.45	5.09	5.29	5.03	3.61	3.75	Pleasant
Strong	3.41	3.27	2.65	2.60	3.19	3.33	3.54	3.79	3.91	4.21	3.73 <	4.26	3.13	3.14	Weak
Obstinate	4.07	3.77	3.45 >[c]	2.89	3.93	3.97	4.12	3.96	4.11	4.16	3.81	3.56	3.18	3.18	Yielding
Practical	2.22	2.53	2.34	2.29	3.08	2.87	2.95	2.94	3.11	3.32	2.85	3.26	3.90	3.70	Unpractical
Conservative	5.40	5.58	5.87	5.77	5.90	5.93	5.75	5.65	4.68	4.49	3.70	3.37	3.18	3.15	Progressive
Dishonest	6.00	6.17	5.09	5.29	4.81	4.62	4.92	4.80	5.15	4.94	5.41	5.06	3.51	3.65	Honest
Free	2.03	2.09	2.27	2.34	1.94	2.41	2.93	3.06	4.25	4.29	4.22	4.33	4.45	4.61	Constrained
Shrewd	2.42	2.50	2.13	2.47	2.56 <	3.14	2.53	2.71	2.57	2.64	2.23	2.03	4.53	4.32	Not shrewd
Ugly	4.84	4.88	5.17	5.04	5.33 >	4.87	5.22 >	4.68	4.90	4.43	4.61	4.31	3.26	3.47	Beautiful
Cold	5.01	4.94	5.07	5.12	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.46	4.30	4.47	4.36	4.65	4.83	4.87	Warm

[a] Sephardim [b] Ashkenazim [c] > greater than, by at least .50

3. Ethnic concepts: religious and non-religious criterion groups. Religion does make a difference. On the basis of a direct question pupils classified themselves into (a) very religious and religious, (b) traditional, and (c) non-religious and anti-religious subjects. The 163 in the first and the 344 in the last of these three groups were called religious and non-religious and are about to be compared. The intermediate traditional grouping resembles the non-religious one in most respects.

With 1/2 scale unit as a reliable difference we find sharp discrepancies about the concepts JEW FROM ABROAD and JEW. Religious subjects find these two types of Jew more sociable, industrious, pleasant, strong, practical, honest and beautiful. The largest single difference in Table 6 reaches the magnitude of 1.42; it is over ME on the conservative-progressive scale. Non-religious youngsters think of themselves as distinctly more progressive than do religious ones. It would seem that this is a crucial point, and it will play a part in the conclusions of this paper.

4. Communal concepts: Total Group. Here results from the nine-concept SDC-II are reported (Table 7). It will be recalled that SDC-I was used for purposes of establishing confidence intervals. Concepts are again arranged in order of distance from ME, although as we shall see, the basis for the order of concepts is not as secure as it is for ethnic concepts. Just to remind ourselves, the communal concepts are ME, ONE OF MY OWN ETHNIC GROUP, TYPICAL ISRAELI, ASHKENAZIC JEW, IDEAL PERSON, YEMENITE JEW, SEPHARDIC JEW, MOROCCAN JEW, and ARAB: this is the order of distance from ME.

TABLE 6

Mean Scale Values of Ethnic Concepts

Religious (N = 163) and Non-Religious (N = 344) Subjects

Scales	ME		ISRAELI		AMERICAN NON JEW		JEW IN AMERICA		JEW FROM ABROAD		JEW		ISRAEL ARAB		Opposites
	R	NR	R	NR	R	NR	R	NR	R	NR	R	NR	R	NR	
Not sociable	5.91	5.60	5.95	5.76	5.37	5.35	5.33	5.21	5.61 >	4.73	5.50	5.66	3.69 <	4.31	Sociable
Lazy	5.36[a] >	4.84	5.66	5.28	5.20	4.99	5.28	5.04	5.46	5.87	5.06	4.98	4.50	4.73	Industrious
Unpleasant	5.67	5.57	5.63	5.34	5.26	5.21	5.44	5.07	5.67 >	4.81	5.72 >	4.72	3.39	3.88	Pleasant
Strong	3.35	3.29	2.48	2.69	3.12	3.36	3.78	3.81	3.82 <	4.38	3.50 <	4.49	2.97	3.16	Weak
Obstinate	4.22 >	3.65	3.29	2.84	4.06	3.89	4.21	3.94	4.27	4.04	3.53	3.66	3.90 >	3.22	Yielding
Practical	2.36	2.54	2.33	2.32	3.05	2.76	2.90	2.90	2.93 <	3.43	2.36 <	3.58	3.88	3.68	Unpractical
Conservative	4.58 <	6.00	5.52	5.90	5.71	5.98	5.49	5.66	4.71	4.49	3.69	3.27	3.12	3.10	Progressive
Dishonest	6.23	6.18	5.18	5.29	4.50	4.72	5.12	4.68	5.43 >	4.73	5.85 >	4.81	3.28	3.76	Honest
Free	3.15	2.93	2.50	2.33	2.39	2.33	3.24	2.94	4.12	4.33	3.99 <	4.51	4.26 <	4.79	Constrained
Shrewd	2.61	2.42	2.36	2.49	3.07	3.03	2.72	2.72	2.49	2.73	1.87	2.17	4.55	4.27	Not shrewd
Ugly	4.78	4.89	5.18	5.01	4.94	4.89	4.99	4.65	4.89 >	4.27	4.90 >	4.07	3.34	3.46	Beautiful
Cold	4.87	4.83	5.13	5.05	4.22	4.55	4.35	4.42	4.57	4.31	4.85	4.42	4.75	4.98	Warm

---

[a] Greater than, by at least .50

TABLE 7

Mean Scale Values of Communal Concepts

National Sample (N = 286)

Scales	ME	ONE OF OWN ETHNIC GROUP	TYPICAL ISRAELI	ASHKENAZIC JEW	IDEAL PERSON	YEMENITE JEW	SEPHARDIC JEW	MOROCCAN JEW	ARAB	Opposites
Sociable	2. 12[ab]	2. 35[b]	2. 28[b]	2. 87[b]	1. 59[b]	2. 55[b]	2. 78[b]	3. 81	4. 29	Not sociable
Lazy	5. 31[b]	5. 68[b]	5. 37[b]	4. 9[illegible]	6. 59[b]	5. 97[b]	5. 24[b]	4. 35	4. 26	Industrious
Unpleasant	5. 88[b]	5. 66[b]	5. 49[b]	5. 40[b]	6. 67[b]	5. 35[b]	4. 97	4. 18	3. 22	Pleasant
Strong	3. 25	2. 79[b]	2. 62[b]	3. 79	2. 12[b]	3. 49	2. 52[b]	2. 40[b]	3. 00	Weak
Strict	4. 49	3. 87	3. 89	3. 69	4. 44	4. 15	3. 79	3. 05	3. 23	Lenient
Practical	2. 32[b]	2. 39[b]	2. 42[b]	2. 75[b]	1. 53[b]	2. 62	2. 97[b]	3. 55	4. 00	Unpractical
Traditional	5. 13[b]	4. 40	5. 35[b]	5. 27[b]	5. 28[b]	2. 56[b]	2. 82[b]	3. 50	2. 54[b]	Progressive
Not tempered	4. 59	4. 20	3. 86	5. 06[b]	5. 17[b]	4. 42	2. 88[b]	2. 22[b]	2. 48[b]	Moderate
Free	3. 03	3. 29	2. 11[b]	3. 01	2. 72[b]	4. 20	3. 98	3. 03	3. 99	Constrained
Shrewd	2. 40[b]	2. 22[b]	2. 17[b]	2. 21[b]	1. 45[b]	2. 88[b]	3. 20	3. 46	4. 78	Not shrewd
Ugly	5. 09[b]	5. 19[b]	5. 19[b]	5. 37[b]	5. 88[b]	4. 00	4. 65	4. 64	3. 19	Beautiful
Cold	4. 41	4. 63	4. 87	3. 79	4. 24	4. 38	5. 15[b]	5. 49[b]	5. 15[b]	Warm

a For values < 4. 0, the mean judgement is toward the left-hand term, for values > 4. 0, toward the right-hand term.

b Values departing from 4. 0 (neutral) by at least one scale value: "meaningful" characteristics.

It is worth while to take a special look at the characterization of IDEAL PERSON because, in the absence of factor analysis, ratings on that concept may give us a clue as to what qualities are evaluatively desirable. IDEAL PERSON is sociable, industrious, pleasant, strong, practical, progressive, moderate, free, and shrewd. TYPICAL ISRAELI is close to being an IDEAL PERSON, except that IDEAL PERSON is more moderate. Significantly, IDEAL PERSON is neither strict, nor lenient, neither cold nor warm. These, then, are the distinctly non-evaluative scales.

How does ASHKENAZIC JEW compare with SEPHARDIC JEW? Not unexpectedly, the former is held to be less strong or traditional (by a wide margin!), but more moderate, free, shrewd, and cold. Comparing different concepts on the same scales we are applying the reliable-difference-criterion of .75. YEMENITE JEW is very similar to SEPHARDIC JEW, but MOROCCAN JEW is less sociable, more lazy, strict, hot tempered, constrained and progressive. These subjects apparently think of a Yemenite as a Sephardic Jew while MOROCCAN JEW tends to be different, in fact next to the ARAB, the least attractive type. ARAB is traditional, hot-tempered and warm. To be warm and hot-tempered are qualities shared by SEPHARDIC JEW, MOROCCAN JEW and ARAB.

Scanning concept columns in Table 7 we find that the progression in "meaningfulness" does not proceed monotonously from left to right; in other words, there is no clear relation between distance from ME and polarization. The first, second, fourth and seventh concepts display seven polarization each. The matter is complicated further by the fact that the third and fifth concepts, TYPICAL ISRAELI and IDEAL PERSON, are the most polarized in the lot. Communal concepts, in their present composition, do not clarify the question of what is the most plausible explanation of agreed-upon departures from neutral, psychological distance or level of abstraction.

5. Communal concepts: Oriental and European criterion groups.

166 Oriental subjects differ from 122 European classmates in their evaluation of SEPHARDIC and MOROCCAN JEW (Table 8). SEPHARDIC JEW looks less hot-tempered, more industrious, pleasant, practical and shrewd to the Sephardic pupil; MOROCCAN JEW, more sociable, industrious, pleasant, shrewd and beautiful. On ME, ONE OF MY OWN ETHNIC GROUP, TYPICAL ISRAELI, ASHKENAZIC JEW, IDEAL PERSON, YEMENITE JEW and ARAB there is fair agreement. It certainly makes analytic sense that these particular criterion groups should be divided on SEPHARDIC and MOROCCAN JEW. That they should also be in fair agreement on ASHKENAZIC JEW attests to the prevailing Western norms.

Ethnic and Communal Attitudes

1. Measurement. In Osgood's system attitudes are primarily evaluative activity; operationally, they can be indexed as the good-bad scales of the semantic differential. Since no factor analysis was carried

TABLE 8

Communal Concepts

Oriental (N - 166) and European (N - 122) Subjects

	ME		ONE OF OWN ETHNIC GROUP		TYPICAL ISRAELI		ASHKENAZIC JEW		IDEAL PERSON		YEMENITE JEW		SEPHARDIC JEW		MOROCCAN JEW		ARAB		
Scales	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	Opposites
Sociable	1.94	2.38	2.25	2.48	2.17	2.42	3.00	2.69	1.61	1.56	2.52	2.59	2.57	3.07	3.37 <	4.40	4.28	4.31	Not sociable
Lazy	5.49	5.06	5.77	5.56	5.40	5.32	4.74	5.31	6.54	6.67	6.02	5.89	5.62 >	4.72	4.75 >	3.79	4.46	3.97	Industrious
Unpleasant	5.96	5.76	5.57	5.78	5.49	5.50	5.19	5.69	6.60	6.77	5.34	5.36	5.32 >	4.49	4.53 >	3.70	3.24	3.22	Pleasant
Strong	3.17	3.38	2.53	3.14	2.60	2.66	4.11 >[a]	3.36	2.16	2.07	3.16 <	3.96	2.41	2.67	2.37	2.42	2.99	3.00	Weak
Strict	4.67	4.23	4.02	4.66	3.94	3.82	3.68	3.69	4.57	4.26	3.97	4.39	3.88	3.58	3.14	2.92	3.20	3.27	Lenient
Practical	2.23	2.24	2.44	2.32	2.48	2.35	3.04 >	2.36	1.65	1.38	2.33	3.02	2.57 <	3.52	3.32	3.86	3.77	4.32	Unpractical
Traditional	5.11	5.17	3.75 <	5.29	5.36	5.32	5.23	5.31	5.28	5.27	2.75	2.30	3.03	2.52	3.54	3.43	2.47	2.63	Progressive
Hot-tempered	4.70	4.42	3.71 <	4.88	3.95	3.74	5.16	4.93	5.30	4.99	4.36	4.50	3.19 >	2.46	2.39	1.99	2.48	2.47	Moderate
Free	3.14	2.87	3.54	2.95	2.24	1.92	3.04	2.97	2.76	2.67	4.12	4.31	4.01	3.94	3.07	2.97	4.01	3.97	Constrained
Shrewd	2.33	2.50	2.38	2.02	2.07	2.32	2.38	2.00	1.47	1.43	2.69	3.15	2.73	3.84	3.08	3.98	4.68	4.92	Not shrewd
Ugly	5.10	5.08	5.06	5.38	5.19	5.19	5.44	5.28	5.86	5.92	3.98	4.04	4.80	4.44	4.96	1.20	3.25	3.09	Beautiful
Cold	4.33	4.51	4.88	4.29	4.74	5.05	3.55	4.13	4.08	4.45	4.39	4.38	5.13	5.17	5.54	5.42	5.27	5.00	Warm

[a] Greater than by at least .75

out in the present study, evaluative scales will have to be defined in terms of certain reference concepts. ME and/or ISRAELI on SDE-I and IDEAL PERSON on SDE-II are almost certain to be evaluated with favor. Ergo, the pole of an adjective pair to which mean scores on these concepts point becomes the favored pole. All but obstinate-yielding, cold-warm (in part), and strict-lenient satisfied these criteria; attitude scores were summed and averaged over the means on all other scales after they had been suitably re-directed. Two comparisons seemed of the greatest relevance in view of the kind of differences that had been noted among criterion groups in the characterization of concepts: between religious and non-religious respondents on SDE-I and between Oriental and European subjects on SDC-II.

2. Results. Evaluations are generally on the favorable side, that is above 4.00. Mildly negative exceptions are ISRAELI ARAB and ARAB; even they are less than half a scale unit below 4.00. MOROCCAN JEW is evaluated unfavorably by Ashkenazic pupils, but not by Oriental ones. (Table 9).

Let us first look at comparisons on ethnic concepts (SDE-I). 2
JEW FROM ABROAD and JEW are judged more favorably by the religious than by the non-religious, by a reliable margin. At the same time ISRAELI has the edge on JEW with both religious and non-religious youngsters. It seems a bit odd that the non-religious favor AMERICAN NON JEW above JEW or JEW FROM ABROAD. Shades of self-hatred?

TABLE 9

Attitudes toward Ethnic and Communal Concepts

SDE-I			SDC-II		
	Subjects			Subjects	
Concepts	Religious	Non-Religious	Concepts	Oriental	European
ME	5.31	5.39	ME	5.36	5.21
ISRAELI	5.55	5.47	ONE OF OWN GROUP	5.07	5.40
AMERICAN NON-JEW	5.14	5.17	TYPICAL ISRAELI	5.28	5.24
JEW IN AMERICA	5.09	4.98	ASHKENAZIC JEW	5.02	5.31
JEW FROM ABROAD	5.04	4.50	IDEAL PERSON	5.99	6.05
JEW	5.21	4.38	YEMENITE JEW	4.51	4.51
ISRAELI ARAB	3.77	3.93	SEPHARDIC JEW	4.77	4.16
			MOROCCAN JEW	4.50	3.95
			ARAB	3.61	3.48
Overall	5.01	4.83	Overall	4.90	4.81

Not quite; all these evaluations are on the positive side and differences are merely relative. Even religious 11th graders evaluate AMERICAN NON JEW, JEW FROM ABROAD, and JEW about equally. In these findings lies the real strength of the semantic differential. It is doubtful whether more direct measurement of attitudes would have brought out a preference for AMERICAN NON JEW by a majority of the sample.

Turning to SDC-II comparisons of Communal concepts we might expect Oriental and European groups each to prefer his own. This is true enough of European youth; all the Western types are judged by them well above 5.00 and all the Near Eastern ones (Jewish and non-Jewish) well below it. But Oriental subjects behave asymmetrically and also rate Western types more highly than Near Eastern ones even though by smaller margins. What may be something of a puzzle is the fact that ONE OF OWN ETHNIC GROUP is above 5.00 while YEMENITE, SEPHARDIC and MOROCCAN JEW are below it in the estimation of Sephardic subjects. This suggests differentiation within the Oriental sample. Each subject evaluates his own ethnic group more favorably than at least some of the other communal groups generally grouped as "Sephardic Jews." The fact that outsiders lump together "Sephardic" Jews obviously does not obligate a Yemenite, for example, to do the same. He may think very high of OWN ETHNIC GROUP but inflattingly of MOROCCAN JEW. There is no "Sephardic" solidarity in evaluation.

Attitudes of all subjects tend to favor Western types, both Jewish and non Jewish, over Oriental, Near Eastern ones. As between Jewish and non Jewish types we find a certain balance among religious subjects but even they do not prefer Jewish content.

The Configuration of Concepts

1. Measurement. The notion of semantic similarity can be extended to geometric distance. The D statistic serves to represent affinity of meaning in multi-dimensional space. 14) The closer two concepts are in meaning the closer together they appear in space. When two dimensions underlie inter concept distances these can be plotted on a sheet of paper to some convenient scale and will span. The representation of three dimensions requires a three-dimensional model reminiscent of molecular structure. Beyond three dimensions "semantic" space becomes theoretical and can no longer be visualized.

Fortunately, for purposes of conceptualization, two dimensions seem to suffice to account for inter-concept distances of ethnic concepts and, though much less clearly, of communal ones as well. Our concepts can be represented as circles on a sheet of paper separated by distances that symbolize differences in affective-connotative meaning.

2. The configuration of national concepts. The arrangement of concepts from left to right (and top to bottom) in Fig. 1 was suggested by certain orderly relations that exist among inter-concept distances (D's). When

ethnic concepts are placed the way they are, the system of columns and rows that is called a D matrix reveals an interesting structure. D's are smallest near the diagonal and with very few exceptions increase as one moves out and away from them both horizontally and vertically. This kind of structure is called a simplex; concepts are now so ordered that any two adjacent concepts are closest to each other in affective-connotative meaning and, presumably, psychological distance.[15)] The sequence extending from ISRAELI to ISRAELI ARAB represents a continuum of increasing distance from ISRAELI and ME. ME, for example, is closest to ISRAELI and AMERICAN NON JEW, farther from JEW IN AMERICA, and farthest from ISRAELI ARAB. And so forth. One may seek further confirmation of the simplex in the fact that column sums decrease toward the center of the sequence (JEW IN AMERICA) and then increase again. In a perfect simplex the relation between column sums would be proportional and symmetrical.

What meaning shall we read into the sequence? Given the high orderliness of distance relations it is unlikely that the sequence is fortuitous. So, at the risk of ex post facto theorizing, we shall suggest at least one underlying dimension or facet, Western vs. Oriental orientation; possibly a second one, Religiosity (mainly Jewishness). As we move from left to right, from ME toward ISRAELI ARAB, we seem to proceed from a secular Western orientation to a traditional Near Eastern one. Extra-polating backward, this would make ME and ISRAELI Western and secular.

Fig. I

Ethnic Concepts

Inter-Concept Distances (D's)

National Sample (N = 749)

	ISRAELI	ME	AM. NON-JEW	JEW IN AMERICA	JEW FROM ABROAD	JEW	ISRAELI ARAB
ISRAELI		1.64	1.81	2.09	3.38	3.81	5.55
ME	1.64		1.94	1.70	2.59	3.19	5.44
AMERICAN NON JEW	1.81	1.94		.98	2.66	3.55	4.89
JEW IN AMERICA	2.08	1.70	.98		1.79	2.77	4.57
JEW FROM ABROAD	3.38	2.59	2.66	1.79		1.38	3.74
JEW	3.81	3.19	3.55	2.77	1.38		3.70
ISRAELI ARAB	5.55	5.44	4.89	4.57	3.74	3.70	
Sums	18.27	16.50	15.83	13.89	15.54	18.40	27.89

Scale

1 D = 2 cm.

Distances span more or less when plotted to scale. In this there is confirmation of an essential two-dimensionality. With minor deviations, the configuration of concepts, as plotted (Fig. 1 above), is isomorphous with the D matrix. Visual inspection reveals the relatively great distance of JEW and JEW FROM ABROAD from ME–ISRAELI. The self is closer to America, both Jewish and non-Jewish, than to old-country JEW. The unsettling feature of this analysis is the considerable gap between ISRAELI and JEW. The two are quite dissimilar in the associations they evoke.

The general structure described above repeats itself in the perceptions of religious and non-religious sub samples, with one crucial difference: the ME of the religious and of the non-religious are at different locations in the sequence of concepts. The ME of religious respondents appears between JEW FROM ABROAD and JEW when an effort is made to optimize simplex structure. The ME of the secular is between ISRAELI and AMERICAN NON-JEW. Certainly, it would be hard to find a more dramatic expression of the difference between representatives of two major value patterns in Israel.

The structure of the religious matrix (Fig. 2) strains the simplex order and distances (D's) no longer span. This is because of a certain inconsistency on the part of ME. Thus, ME is close to concepts on both the near and the far end of the continuum. It is close to ISRAELI, but also to JEW. The religious subject identifies with aspects which, in a more comprehensive sense, he views as distant from one another.

Fig. 2
Ethnic Concepts
Inter-Concept Distances (D's)
Religious Sample (N = 163)

	ISRAELI	AM. NON-JEW	JEW IN AMERICA	JEW FROM ABROAD	ME	JEW	ISRAELI ARAB
ISRAELI		2.03	2.19	2.64	2.10	2.80	5.91
AMERICAN NON JEW	2.03		1.35	2.48	2.57	3.50	5.06
JEW IN AMERICA	2.19	1.35		1.35	1.81	2.64	5.21
JEW FROM ABROAD	2.64	2.48	1.33		1.53	1.74	5.21
ME	2.10	2.57	1.81	1.53		1.83	5.73
JEW	2.80	3.50	2.64	1.74	1.83		5.57
ISRAELI ARAB	5.91	5.06	5.21	5.21	5.73	5.57	
Sums	17.67	16.99	14.53	14.93	15.57	18.08	32.69

Non-Religious Sample (N = 344)

	ISRAELI	ME	AM. NON-JEW	JEW IN AMERICA	JEW FROM ABROAD	JEW	ISRAELI ARAB
ISRAELI		1.60	1.71	2.15	3.82	4.52	5.33
ME	1.60		1.80	1.89	3.25	4.10	5.40
AMERICAN NON JEW	1.71	1.80		.94	2.96	4.59	4.83
JEW IN AMERICA	2.15	1.89	.94		2.11	3.20	4.35
JEW FROM ABROAD	3.82	3.25	2.96	2.11		1.45	3.14
JEW	4.52	4.10	4.59	3.20	1.45		3.03
ISRAELI ARAB	5.33	5.40	4.83	4.53	3.14	3.03	
Sums	19.13	19.04	16.83	14.82	16.73	20.89	26.08

3. The configuration of communal concepts. The relation among distances in the matrix of communal concepts proved to be problematic; no more than a feeble approximation to the simplex was possible. For example, D's refused to increase along the vertical axis off the diagonal. Hence the sequence of concepts shown in Fig. 3 is somewhat in doubt. Its strongest support comes from the monotonic increase of distances in the sequence when concepts are taken from ONE OF OWN ETHNIC GROUP and ME.

What may be hypothesized on the basis of this semi-structure is a progression from European to Oriental communities, with European vs. Oriental community as the major facet. This parallels the ethnic dimension of Western vs. Oriental orientation. ME and TYPICAL ISRAELI are close to the European Jewish end of the continuum which is not surprising, but ONE OF OWN ETHNIC GROUP is, too, and that is surprising with a sample close to 60% Oriental Jews.

Considering the somewhat arbitrary sequence of communal concepts it is worth supplementing the semi-simplex by a cluster analysis. Concepts can be said to cluster when distances among members of the cluster are minimized, on the average, as compared with the mean of distances between clusters. This approach leads to two clusters: ME-TYPICAL ISRAELI-ASHKENAZIC JEW - IDEAL PERSON, having a mean within-D of 2.40; and YEMENITE JEW - SEPHARDIC JEW - MOROCCAN JEW - ARAB (mean within-D : 3.32). The mean distance between all the concepts

Fig. 3

Communal Concepts

Inter-Concept Distances (D's) - National Sample (N = 286)

	ONE OF OWN ETHNIC GROUP	ME	TYPICAL ISRAELI	ASHKENAZIC JEW	IDEAL PERSON	YEMENITE JEW	SEPHARDIC JEW	MOROCCAN JEW	ARAB
ONE OF OWN ETHNIC GROUP		1.32	1.63	2.09	2.68	2.64	2.75	3.96	5.10
ME	1.32		1.63	1.67	2.50	3.27	3.65	4.69	6.29
TYPICAL ISRAELI	1.63	1.63		2.33	2.85	4.00	3.62	4.03	6.15
ASHKENAZIC JEW	2.09	1.67	2.33		3.44	3.65	4.10	4.69	6.15
IDEAL PERSON	2.68	2.50	2.85	3.44		4.69	5.22	6.43	8.26
YEMENITE JEW	2.64	3.27	4.00	3.65	4.69		2.36	4.21	4.69
SEPHARDIC JEW	2.75	3.65	3.62	4.10	5.22	2.36		2.29	3.58
MOROCCAN JEW	3.96	4.69	4.03	4.69	6.73	4.21	2.29		2.78
ARAB	5.70	6.29	6.15	6.15	8.26	4.69	3.58	2.78	

of the first cluster and all those of the second is 4.93. The difference between D's within and D's between clusters is highly significant ($t = 4.46$; $df = 26$; $p < .01$).

It is worth noting that ONE OF OWN ETHNIC GROUP is a D of 2.09 from ASHKENAZIC JEW, but a mean D of 3.12 from the Oriental cluster (with ARAB excluded); this, in spite of the predominantly Oriental sample. The Western bias becomes even more pointed when one considers that ASHKENAZIC JEW is close to ME, TYPICAL ISRAELI and IDEAL PERSON.

Unfortunately, the complexity of distance relations in SDC-II does not make for graphic representation. Distances do not span. It is difficult to say whether European vs. Oriental community is the only dimension. Factor analysis would be of little aid since, in our experience, disorderly distance relations, especially with so few concepts, make factor structure equally ambiguous.

The ethnic world of the Oriental and European sub-samples is most similar (Fig. 4). In the Oriental matrix the only clear progression is from ME to ARAB. Using this as the main basis for ordering concepts, the focus of the study being, after all, identity, one again finds ME close to TYPICAL ISRAELI, IDEAL PERSON, and (!) ASHKENAZIC JEW. This arrangement becomes all the more interesting when it is contrasted with the distances from ONE OF MY OWN ETHNIC GROUP. Here the closest concepts are SEPHARDIC JEW and YEMENITE JEW. Oriental

Fig. 4
Communal Concepts
Inter-concept *D*'s

Oriental Sample N = 166	ONE OF OWN ETHNIC GROUP	ME	TYPICAL ISRAELI	IDEAL PERSON	ASHKENAZIC JEW	YEMENITE JEW	SEPHARDIC JEW	MOROCCAN JEW	ARAB
ONE OF MY OWN ETHNIC GROUP		2.11	2.15	3.25	3.35	1.98	1.24	2.19	5.10
ME	2.11		1.71	2.21	2.41	3.08	3.22	4.32	6.40
TYPICAL ISRAELI	2.15	1.71		2.72	2.75	3.65	3.18	3.52	6.10
IDEAL PERSON	3.25	2.21	2.72		3.89	3.78	4.09	4.39	6.03
ASHKENAZIC JEW	3.35	2.41	2.75	3.89		4.32	4.42	5.66	8.18
YEMENITE JEW	1.98	3.08	3.65	3.78	4.32		1.88	3.65	4.63
SEPHARDIC JEW	1.24	3.22	3.18	4.09	4.42	1.88		2.28	4.22
MOROCCAN JEW	2.19	4.32	3.52	4.39	5.66	3.65	2.28		3.28
ARAB	5.10	6.40	6.10	6.03	8.11	4.63	4.22	3.28	

European Sample N = 120	ONE OF OWN ETHNIC GROUP	ASHKENAZIC JEW	ME	TYPICAL ISRAELI	IDEAL PERSON	YEMENITE JEW	SEPHARDIC JEW	MOROCCAN JEW	ARAB
ONE OF MY OWN ETHNIC GROUP		.47	1.13	1.87	2.49	4.01	4.87	5.73	6.67
ASHKENAZIC JEW	.47		1.09	2.03	2.85	3.98	4.87	5.65	6.55
ME	1.13	1.09		1.60	2.96	3.70	4.40	5.30	6.20
TYPICAL ISRAELI	1.87	2.03	1.60		3.08	4.56	4.44	4.91	6.28
IDEAL PERSON	2.49	2.85	2.96	3.08		3.98	4.87	5.65	6.51
YEMENITE JEW	4.01	3.98	3.70	4.56	3.98		3.24	3.18	4.87
SEPHARDIC JEW	4.87	4.87	4.40	4.44	4.87	3.24		2.46	2.17
MOROCCAN JEW	5.73	5.65	5.30	4.91	5.65	5.18	2.46		2.26
ARAB	6.67	6.55	6.20	6.28	6.51	4.87	2.77	2.26	

subjects belong to two worlds and identify with both, once through their selves and once through their group.

It is difficult to know whether this overlapping identification signifies integration or conflict, just as one wonders whether religious subjects, in the light of ethnic concepts, feel part of both Jewishness and Israeliness or are torn between the two. One interpretation would be that integration and conflict are antithetical aspects of adjustment and present at one and the same time. While there may be individual differences in this as in other matters, for the collectivity it is perhaps appropriate to say that Oriental and religious youth, each in their own way, are searching for their place in a culture divided along religious and communal lines. In this they would be performing an important service because a problem which objectively exists has to be experienced before anything can be done about it.

The Ashkenazic youngster perceives his ethnic world with relative clarity. Distance relations among concepts again approach the simplex and afford some confidence in the order they suggest. This order resembles what was found for the total sample (Fig. 3). Two clusters can be described by criteria stated above. Inter-concept distances for ONE OF OWN ETHNIC GROUP, ASHKENAZIC JEW, ME, TYPICAL ISRAELI, and IDEAL PERSON average 1.94; those of YEMENITE JEW, SEPHARDIC JEW, and MOROCCAN JEW, 3.46. Mean $\underline{D}$ between clusters is 5.16. The difference between within-cluster $\underline{D}$'s and between-cluster $\underline{D}$'s is high significant ($\underline{t} = 7.20$, $\underline{df} = 34$, $p < .01$). The large cluster is a European in-group; the other is an Oriental out-group, relatively far from self-referents (ME, ONE OF OWN ETHNIC GROUP). The clarity of perception in this instance is achieved by pushing the non-European element out of sight-and-self. A problem of communal tension is not experienced.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The present study is part of a series exploring the ethnic subregion of ethnic identity in Israeli high school youth. Two main difficulties confront the student of identity: How to conceptualize identity and, once having conceptualized it, how to measure it. In the present study the ethnic region of identity was defined by two subsets of concepts, one to represent more general notions of ethnicity (Israeli-Jewish) and one to represent it in a more specific communal sense. Measurement proceeded by way of semantic differentiation. For this purpose four semantic differentials were developed; two served to estimate the magnitude of reliable differences between means and two were further analyzed in terms of semantic characterization, attitudes, and distance relations.

The major finding is that the perception of order among ethnic concepts reveals remarkable agreement among all youngsters, Oriental or European in lineage, religious or secular in outlook. A reality is defined by all, and this reality is an Israel having a Western, European orientation. If one grants the semantic differential to be measuring the more subtle, affective, connotative aspects of meaning, the Western-European orientation here uncovered need not be entirely conscious. It may be partly submerged, and even denied, if challenged. A more obvious methodology, pair comparison, indicated different results with similar concepts, results that more directly mirror the position taken by public sanction.

Youth of Oriental lineage and those of religious conviction tend to confirm the "reality" of a Western orientation, but each of these sub-groupings displays an ambivalence of its own. Oriental subjects prefer Western-European concepts, but do not disown their own community. Religious subjects identify with things Jewish, whether Eastern or Western. It seems to us that this ambivalence makes for either conflict, integration, or any combination of both. Further study should attempt to specify the circumstances under which Oriental youth experience antithesis or synthesis between their being Western in outlook and Oriental in lineage, and those under which religious youth reconcile or fail to reconcile their ties with things Jewish and non-Jewish.

Let us now review these results in a more detailed manner:

One subset of concepts was composed of general ethnic, non-communal concepts: ISRAELI, ME, AMERICAN NON-JEW, JEW IN AMERICA, JEW FROM ABROAD, JEW, ISRAELI ARAB. These formed a clear, internally consistent structure of the simplex type. The sequence in which concepts are listed is the one obtained when the simplex order is optimized. This means that the progression is from Western to Eastern orientation, though other interpretations may be preferred. The sequence also happens to be that of favorableness of attitude, with ISRAELI and ME topping the list, JEW and ISRAEL ARAB closing it.

The order of concepts changes for the religious sub-sample in that ME now moves to a position between JEW FROM ABROAD and JEW, with other concepts remaining in place. The shift in ME and in ME only, gives rise to our conclusion that both the religious and non-religious tend to view ethnic concepts as the same reality, but while the former shift to a Jewish identity – without at the same time abandoning close ties with ISRAELI – the latter are quite unilaterally Israeli. As for Oriental subjects, they do not differ on these concepts from their European peers.

The other subset of concepts is composed of terms thought to represent communally ethnic stereotypes: ONE OF MY OWN ETHNIC GROUP, ME, TYPICAL ISRAELI, ASHKENAZIC JEW, IDEAL PERSON, YEMENITE JEW, SEPHARDIC JEW, MOROCCAN JEW, ARAB. This time the sequence in which the concepts are listed represents a weak approximation to the order optimal for the simplex, but is approximately correct with respect to decreasing favorableness. The progression suggests a dimension that may be termed European vs. Oriental community. It parallels that of Western vs. Oriental orientation.

The European (Ashkenazic) community is respected by Oriental and European subjects alike, but Orientals also feel close affinity to

ONE OF MY OWN ETHNIC GROUP which to them must be Oriental. It should however be emphasized that the Oriental youngster, as represented in this study, prefers European stereotypes, feels close to them, and structures his world around them. The religious and non-religious are not differentiated on these concepts.

Religious and Oriental youth thus seem to be coping with incongruent elements of culture. The former seek to align with both Jewishness and secularism as symbolized by a Westernized Israeliness. The latter attempt to bridge the gap between East and West. Religious and Oriental youth perform an important function. They are the ones who experience the problem of ethnic tension. They may also be the very ones to achieve the integration and image of the Israeli Jew.

Evidence has recently been quoted by sociologists and demographers as if Near Eastern patterns of culture in Israeli society are rising in direct proportion to the influx and growth of Oriental elements in the population. The findings of our study point to the presence of psychological factors that may well counteract demographic changes. The high school youth sampled here seem to favor a Western image and identify with non-Oriental models. Evaluations and aspirations may be ultimately more important than population trends.

Appendix A

In the following questions we shall ask you to express your feelings towards the image of different kinds of people. In front of you there is a column of attributes opposed by a column of their opposites; attributes and their opposites are separated by a line containing seven spaces.

Express your feelings by placing an x in the proper space.

Examples

FRENCHMAN

Short ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Tall

When you hear the word FRENCHMAN, if you get a picture of someone very tall, mark as follows:

FRENCHMAN

Short ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : _x_ Tall

When you hear the word FRENCHMAN, if you get a picture of someone very short, mark as follows:

FRENCHMAN

Short _x_ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Tall

If the picture you get is neither very tall nor very short mark by an x one of the spaces that seems the most appropriate to the degree of tallness or shortness that you have in mind.

You will probably have difficulty in answering at times, but do not skip any attributes, and do not mark any more than once on each scale. Try to work rapidly, do not linger too long on any one attribute, but express your immediate feelings.

And here is a sample page from SDE I or II :

Not sociable ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Sociable

Lazy ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Industrious

Unpleasant ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Pleasant

Strong ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Weak

Obstinate ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Yielding

Practical ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Unpractical

Conservative ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Progressive

Dishonest ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Honest

Free ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Constrained

Clever ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Not clever

Ugly ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Beautiful

Cold ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Warm

Experience indicates that format and instructions were well understood. Some of the fears about lack of test-taking sophistication, in general, and this age group in particular - all 11th graders - were unfounded.

Appendix B

Pair Comparison and Semantic Differential Results for Eleven Ethnic Concepts

Pair comparison is a psychophysical method of scaling stimuli, here concepts, which calls for their comparison in all possible pairs. It yields scale values which can be used to order the concepts in terms of the criterion which was employed to judge them.

Thirteen Israeli students of the Hebrew University were asked to rate eleven national-ethnic concepts, once by pair comparison and once on a 16-scale semantic differential similar to the ones eventually adopted for this study. Instructions for pair comparison were to judge which concept in each pair was "closer" to the subject. Instructions for the semantic differential were similar to the ones described in Appendix A.

Both methods yield continua from self (ME). The method of computing distances by semantic differentiation is described elsewhere in this paper. In Table 10 the ranks of concepts are listed for both pair comparison and semantic differential. The lower the rank the closer the concept is to self. Distances on the semantic differential are taken from ME AS I WANT TO BE simply because that yielded the order most similar to that of pair comparison. We shall suggest an explanation for this below.

In pair comparison all the "Jewish" concepts precede the non-Jewish ones. This seems to reflect a "socially desirable" or "official"

TABLE 10

The Rank Order of Eleven Concepts by Pair Comparison and Semantic Differential

N = 13 Israeli Students of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Concepts	Pair Comparison	Semantic Differential
ME AS I AM	1	3
ME AS I WANT TO BE	2	1[a]
ISRAELI	3	2
AMERICAN JEW	4	5
POLISH JEW	5	10
YEMENITE JEW	6	6
MOROCCAN JEW	7	8
AMERICAN CHRISTIAN	8	4
ISRAELI ARAB	9	9
POLISH CHRISTIAN	10	7
EGYPTIAN ARAB	11	11

[a] Taken from ME AS I WANT TO BE since thisyielded the greatest correlation with pair comparison ranks (= .681 as against = .285 when distances are taken from ME AS I AM)

point of view. The fact that the ordering is almost free of "error" shows that respondents are fully aware of what they are doing in this method and can prevent departures from deliberate, logical procedure.

The semantic differential, as against this, places western concepts ahead of "traditional" ones and thereby expresses undercurrents of sentiment that are sometimes heard in private conversations. This is the kind of result we should expect if the semantic differential does, as it claims, tap the more affective aspects of meaning.

This would also explain why the semantic differential results come closest to those of pair comparison when distances are taken from ME AS I WISH TO BE. ME AS I WISH TO BE is an ideal, normative, detached form of self from which distances might very well be more "official" than they would be from the more phenomenological, involved ME AS I AM.

Notes

1) C.O. Osgood, G.J. Suci, and P.H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

2) J.J. Jenkins, W.A. Russell, and G.J. Suci, "An Atlas of Semantic Profiles for 360 Words", American Journal of Psychology, LXXI (1958), 688-99.

3) C.E. Osgood, "Studies on the Generality of Affective Meaning Sustems", American Psychologist, XVIII (1962), 10-28.

4) C.S. Moss, "Current and Projected Status of Semantic Differential Research", The Psychological Record, X (1960), 47-54.

5) C.E. Osgood, E.E. Ware and C. Morris, "Analysis of Connotative Meanings of a Variety of Human Values as Expressed by American College Students", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXII (1961), 62-73.

6) T.R. Husek and M.C. Wittrock, "The Dimensions of Attitudes toward Teachers as Measured by the Semantic Differential", Journal of Educational Psychology, LIII (1962), 109-13.

7) When the scores that can be obtained on a measuring instrument restrict the full expression of individual differences by setting the upper score limits lower than their full range demands, one speaks of ceiling effects. In this case a score of 7 is the top limit on any one adjective scale. Many rate ME AS I WISH TO BE at that limit, though they might rate it higher if they only could. The potential variance of scores is thus restricted by "ceiling effects."

8) L.J. Cronbach. Essentials of Psychological Testing. Second Edition, New York: Harper, 1960, p. 120.

9) S. Herman and O. Schild. "Ethnic Role Conflict in a Cross-Cultural situation", Human Relations, XIII (1960), 215-228.

10) Cronbach, op. cit., p. 121.

11) J. P. Guilford. . Psychometric Methods. Second Edition. New York: McGraw Hill, 1954, pp. 169-71.

12) Osgood, et. al., op. cit., 126-40.

13) For a discussion of "significance and common sense," see W. L. Hays, Statistics for Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963, p. 299, 300, 326.

14) The D between any two concepts is the square root of the sum of squared differences over all adjective scale values for those concepts. See L. J. Gronbach and N. Glaser, "Assessing Similarity between Profiles," Psychological Bulletin, L (1953), 456-73.

15) L. Guttman. "A New Approach to Factor Analysis: The Radex," in P. R. Lazarsfeld (Ed.). Mathematical Thinking in the Social Sciences. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1954. Also U. G. Foa, "New Developments in Facet Design and Analysis," Psychological Review, LXXII (1965), 262-74. The present analysis was suggested in a communication by Ozer Schild.

Bibliography

Cronbach, L. J., *Essentials of Psychological Testing*. *Second Edition.* New York: Harper, 1960.

Cronbach, L., and N. Glaser, "Assessing Similarity between Profiles," *Psychological Bulletin,* L (1953), 456-73.

Foa, U. G., "New Developments in Facet Design and Analysis," *Psychological Review,* LXXII (1965), 262-74.

Guilford, J. P., *Psychometric Methods,* *Second Edition,* New York: McGraw Hill, 1954.

Guttman, L. "A New Approach to Factor Analysis: the Radex," in P. R. Lazarsfeld (Ed.), *Mathematical Thinking in the Social Sciences*, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1954.

Herman, S., and O. Schild, "Ethnic Role Conflict in a Cross-cultural Situation," *Human Relations*, XIII (1960), 215-228.

Husek, T. R., and C. Wittrock, "The Dimensions of Attitudes toward Teachers as Measured by the Semantic Differential." *Journal of Educational Psychology,* LIII (1962), 209-13.

Jenkins, J. J., W. A. Russell, and G. J. Suci, "An Atlas of Semantic Profiles for 360 Words," *American Journal of Psychology,* LXXI (1958), 688-699.

Moss, C. S., "Current and Projected Status of Semantic Differential Research," *The Psychological Record* , X (1960), 47-54.

Osgood, C. E., "Studies on the Generality of Affective Meaning Systems," *American Psychologist,* XVIII (1962), 10-28.

Osgood, C. E., G. J. Suci, and P. H. Tannenbaum. *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Ill. Press, 1957.

Osgood, C.E., F.E. Ware, and C. Morris, "Analysis of Connotative Meanings of a Variety of Human Values as expressed by American College Students." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXII (1961), 62-73.

CHAPTER III

THE ISRAELI JEWISH IDENTITY IN AN ISRAELI SECONDARY SCHOOL

John E. Hofman
Haifa College of
The Hebrew University, Jerusalem

LIST OF CONTENTS

Page

PROBLEM AND BACKGROUND 70

DESIGN AND MEASUREMENT 75

ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEW DATA 81

- The School 81
- The Jewish Subidentity 84
- Perceived Influences 90
- Opinion Leaders 101

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE DATA 103

- Self Variables 105
- Cognitive Variables 109
- Test Retest Reliability 109
- Group Comparisons 111
  1. Between Grades
  2. Between Questionnaire Administrations
  3. Between Individuals of the eleventh grade
- Social Relations 121

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS 124

APPENDICES 128

- Bibliography 150
- Notes 152

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.	Opinions concerning Influences on Jewish Identity	91
Table 2.	Hierarchy of Perceived Influences on Jewish Identity	92
Table 3.	Self Variables	107
Table 4.	Cognitive Variables	110
Table 5.	Reliability. Test Retest Reliability	112
Table 6.	Comparison of Mean Scores by Grades Eight to Twleve	113
Table 7.	Comparison of Mean Scores among Eleventh Grades	118
Table 8.	Comparison between Interviewees and Non-Interviewees in Eleventh Grade	120
Table 9.	Inter-Pupil Agreement	123
Table 10.	Who am I? Eight Choices	147
Table 11.	Who am I? First three Choices	149

PROBLEM AND BACKGROUND

This study is conceived as a follow-up on a country-wide survey of ethnic identity among high school youth in Israel. It was carried out in one secondary school. We felt that an intensive study combining survey and interview methodology would add depth to our previous work and provide insight into the motives, rationalizations, and channels of communication associated with ethnic values and attitudes.

Of course, findings from any one school cannot be generalized in a country as heterogeneous as Israel, but the institutional setting provides advantages of focus and accessibility that may compensate to some extent for the less in representativeness.

A school presents a vantage point from which to observe the several forms of formal and informal influences likely to affect attitudes toward the self and others. The relatively clear boundaries of the situation delimit influences and clarify the task. A home setting, though possibly more crucial, is uneven, inaccessible, and quite often of uncertain dimensions. Street, youth movement, and media of communication are diffuse and probably less influential than school and home. Although these others should be studied, the project on identity had after all begun as a survey of opinion in schools; the study of schools seemed like the logical extension of the larger effort.

There was a light shift in the problem as conceptualized. The survey had focused on what new became a "dependent" variable, that is, Jewish and Israeli identity. A new independent variable emerged in the form of influences on identity. Independent and dependent variables are not to be taken as experimental events, as the study is quite frankly explorative. Yet, it will clarify the problem if one thinks of forces that influence, on the one hand, and of identities that are influenced, on the other.

The most pervasive influence in schools appears to be what has been called value-climate. The prototype of value climate research in school settings is Newcomb's Bennington study (1943). He demonstrated the effectiveness of an established viewpoint as an influence on incoming college freshmen. Much as the study was praised it does not seem to have been widely emulated. Small groups research become popular about the same time, and it is only now that natural settings are again gaining in favour.

There is no dearth of studies on classroom climate, possibly because this was closer to current notions of legitimate or feasible research (See review by Withall and Lewis, 1963). Such studies took their cue from the famous Lewin-inspired inquiry into styles of leadership and their effect on group behavior (White and Lippitt, 1960).

Two studies bearing on value climate in high schools are Hollingshead's Elmtown's Youth (1949) and Gordon's The Social System of the High School (1957). In both, social class is found to be a correlate of social associations. Coleman (1961) acknowledges his debt to Hollingshead and Gordon, but goes beyond social class in his search for the determinants of the outcome that interests him, status. He reasons that a school in which there are many kinds of recognized activities provides more avenues to status satisfaction than one in which approval centers on academic achievement or athletic prowess or social success. Accordingly, he distinguishes between pluralistic and monolithic value climates. He describes and analyzes such climates in ten schools of varying locale.

Though Coleman does not define value climate he seems to regard it as a kind of behavior setting mediating between certain antecedent conditions (of which social class is only one) and certain outcomes, such as a person's status in the school society. In a similar vein we think of value climate as a set of interactional variables (i. e., human relations, forms of control, communication) arising from teachers' and pupils' goals and background, and leading to attitudes, values, and ethnic identity, among other things. A value climate can perhaps be defined as the behavior setting in which attitudinal products are formed. In a more loose sense it becomes both the setting and the products.

Israel has long been at odds on the question of the place of values in secondary schools or, in fact, in schools at all. The sector affected by the Labor movement has been a leader in fostering a progressive curriculum which places service, cooperativeness, and the nation at the core of education (Simon, 1962). Many urban institutions, too, have tried to achieve some synthesis between preparation for careers and service to the public. The rapid development of the post-war period, however, has directed major efforts toward the mastery of skills and subject matter so that more idealistic orientations have been on the defensive.

Apprehensive educators have noted a renewed interest in the Jewish heritage. While nation building has been a concern all along, the interest in Judaism and Jewishness appears to have received a special impetus during the past few years, though in many circles, of course, it always commanded major attention. It is the secular public that has rediscovered its origins and would like more awareness of them in the schools.

Coinciding with a public demand for more Jewishness in schools came the more general insistence on value education, or Education in the broader sense. In an article called "Teaching for Education" the philosopher N. Rothenstreich (1961) called for a scrutiny of the curriculum in terms of what it does and does not do for pupils' values. There were some misgivings on the morality of imposing values on the young (Klineberger, 1962), but the Ministry of Education introduced an intensive and widely publicized program of Jewish "Consciousness."

In a recent study Adar and Adler examined value education in elementary Schools mainly frequented by the children of immigrants from underdeveloped countries and found it wanting in many respects (1965). The teaching of values does not always proceed with a proper recognition of pupils' background and level of understanding. Their study also points to the virtues of observational methodology. The otherwise excellent Coleman study, which relied exclusively on questionnaires, and our own project might have benefited by incorporating observational techniques.

The conception of ethnic identity in the present study is indebted to the work of Miller (1963), but goes beyond it in several specific respects 1). Of particular relevance is his discussion of structure (Ibid., 674-7). The distinction, for example, between role ("the minimum of attitudes and behavior required for participation in the overt expression of the social position") and subidentity ("a cluster of all the attributes manifested by a person, not the minimal requirements for a position") is pertinent to the fact that we tended to ask teachers about how pupils should feel and behave as Israelis and Jews, and pupils about how they actually feel and behave.

The broad problem of the present investigation may be stated in the form of a compound question: What is the state of ethnic identity in one secondary school and what are perceived to be the influences upon it? This question revolves around two foci, identity and influences. Evidence on identity was obtained mainly by a survey instrument condensed from the one that had been used in the larger country-wide study of eleventh grades. Influences, formal and informal, within the school and outside of it were probed through interviews with samples of teachers and pupils.

Readers of this report will share our feeling that much more could and should be done both in the assessment of identity and in the tracing of influences. Young people in particular appear to experience considerable difficulty, often reluctance and opposition, in describing the state of their ethnic identity and even more in analyzing the forces that seem to have influenced it.

DESIGN AND MEASUREMENT

Let us refer to the school as Hillside High School. It is located in a well-to-do neighborhood of one of Israel's cities. It contains six grades, that is two more than the usual high school. Its two lowest grades form, in most of Israel, part of the elementary school system. Hillside High was founded five years ago as part of a move to bring public secondary education to a city in which all such schools had been private. It now has three academic curricula, Literature, Mathematics-Physics, and Biology. There is also a curriculum for laboratory technicians.

Like other schools Hillside has rigid class plans to which pupils are committed with no choice of electives. Classes move up in block which means that the same pupils constitute class units for the first three years and then again for the last three years upon choosing a curriculum. This relative curricular rigidity has the advantage of permitting class cohesiveness due to within-class continuity and the disadvantage of restricting school-wide activities due to between-class compartmentalization.

Entrance examinations are competitive, but as a public-funds school Hillside is accessible to the general public. Children attending come from all over the city, from all socio-economic strata, and from many ethnic groups, both of older and more recent immigrational history. Yet, the composition of Israeli society being what it is, the dominant tone of the school appears to be middle class and Ashkenazic (European), with most children coming from the well-to-do section in which the school is located.

A questionnaire was administered twice, once during the last week of September, 1965 and once in the middle of May, 1966. All classes in the upper four grades were given the instrument, two among four classes in the second grade, and none in the first. The decision to exclude the first grade from the respondent population was based on pre-test results which showed the questions to be too difficult for them. The reason for excluding two further classes in the second grade was that those classes had been used to pre-test the questions in that grade.

Questionnaires were administered in the school auditorium during the first administration in a single day, one entire grade at a time. This reduced the opportunity for discussing the content of the questionnaire among pupils. During the second administration pupils filled out forms in the classrooms. This was less desirable, but we did not insist on the previous method since the questions were by then known anyway.

Between administrations of the questionnaire two samples of pupils were intensely interviewed: a) a random sample of pupils in the first and third classes of the 11th grade: b) a sample of "opinion leaders" as identified by a sociometric instrument. It was hypothesized that the presence of researchers and their activities would place the problem of ethnic identity into relief and thereby affect relevant attitudes. It was further hypothesized that salience thus induced would have the greatest effect among pupils who had been interviewed. In anticipation of results it may be stated that some support was found for the second of these hypotheses.

The measurings instruments were:

a) A questionnaire adapted from the larger survey instruments. - The questions retained were those that best represented the variables of interest in terms of variance and relevance. The administration of the instrument took about 3/4 of an hour or less. The post-version included a few questions that had not been part of the pre-version. See Appendix A and B for translations of the two instruments.

b) An interview schedule composed of two parts. - The first part related to the questionnaire. Interviewees were encouraged to clarify questionnaire replies and to enlarge upon them. The interviewer quoted a respondent about as follows: In the questionnaire you replied so and so; can you tell me more about that? The interview schedule went into much greater detail than the questionnaire and probed deeper. A second part inquired into the matter of influences which had not appeared in the questionnaire at all. The major topics were School, Youth Movement, and Home, with each of these subsuming others. With respect to School, for example, we asked about the general atmosphere, the teachers, lessons, peers, and the perception of their respective influences, among others. The schedule as a whole was structured, but a majority of items called for open-ended replies. The purpose of the interview was less to permit statistical treatment than to provide insight into the pupils' way of thinking about the problem under scrutiny. See Appendix C for a translation of the interview schedule.

c) A brief sociometric questionnaire. - Respondents were asked to name those pupils whom they considered to be influential and those others whom they considered to be their friends. The instrument also called for a rating of satisfaction with the class's social life on a five-point scale. Respondents were encouraged to comment on their rating; these comments constituted part of the evidence on school "atmosphere." The sociometric questionnaire took a few minutes to answer and was administered to all pupils above the first school grade. It later served to identify opinion leaders and to derive indices of class cohesiveness. See Appendix D for a translation of the sociometric questionnaire.

d) A teacher questionnaire which was distributed to all teachers. - It resembled the pupils' questionnaire, but included in addition a number of questions concerning the teachers' perception of pupils' opinions as well as rating scales on factors of Jewish/Israeli identity. Returns were very poor in spite of several appeals and did not lend themselves to extensive treatment.

e) An open-ended interview schedule with principal and a number of 11th grade teachers. The minimally structured interviews were built around the following questions:

1. What do you think is meant by Jewish identity or consciousness?
2. How should these principles express themselves in a secular school?
3. How do they actually express themselves?
4. Do you feel the school should act to strengthen Jewish identity?
5. What do you think your own subject may contribute to this?
6. What are pupils' views on these matters as far as you are aware?
7. What is the influence of school, lessons, and teachers in this?

f) Other techniques were a class discussion with one of the classes in the 11th grade, and end-of-study sessions with interviewers and teachers. The teachers offered comments at a well-attended scheduled meeting.

About half of 44 pupil interviews were carried out by paid college students. In regard to the other half we resorted to student volunteers from the departments of Education and Psychology. All interviewers participated in a two hour training session. Interviews were conducted in a small, quiet room. Teachers were interviewed by a research assistant, Mr. Uri Farago, and the writer.

The sample was composed as follows:

			Questionnaire		
Grade	Class	Sociometry	Before	After	Interviewees
8	1	39	39	39	-
	2	37	-	-	-
	3	36	38	39	-
	4	37	-	-	-
9	1	29	30	29	3
	2	29	34	31	-
	3	36	41	38	3
	4	40	39	38	2
10	1	32	28	28	2
	2	30	30	29	2
	3	36	32	31	1
	4	37	40	35	1
11	1	36	35	36	20
	2	22	24	23	-
	3	16	18	17	10
12	1	19	35	21	-
	2	15	-	-	-
	Total	526	463	434	44

ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEW DATA

The School

In broadest terms the philosophy of Hillside High may be described as one of "Teaching for Education." Following Rothenstreich (1961) this is what the principal, an energetic administrator and well-praised teacher with broad Jewish background, chooses to call it. In a bulletin to teachers he writes:

> We reemphasize this year our dual objective: a broadening of education and a deepening of instruction. During the past years we have come to know our pupils and their parents. We have learned that close personal and constant contact between teacher and pupil, educator and parent, is the best way to educational achievement as well as to an easing of difficulties, indeed very often to the avoidance of their appearance.

One of the most respected teachers in the upper grades states three goals: "... to equip the pupil with an understanding of the world about him, to foster an enriching social life, and to educate him to good citizenship." In actual fact, from all we have seen and heard, the first of these objectives takes precedence, even if the accent is often more on subject matter than on "understanding of the world," possibly on the assumption that the one leads to the other. Some acquaintance with Hillside shows that the atmosphere is businesslike, that social activities are more incidental than planned, and that there is much soul-searching on "good citizenship." As one girl puts it:

> The atmosphere is severe which is as it should be where studies are concerned. But there is undue harshness about small matters like clothing. This is because the Principal is very strict and nothing helps, not even the student council. There are some teachers, mainly young ones, who relate informally to pupils, even talk to them during intermission, and help with crossword puzzles, but others keep their distance, and the whole atmosphere depends on teachers.

The school has a variety of clubs, organizes lectures, symposia, excursions, pre-military activities (2), and such delightful intermission activities as folk dancing by loudspeaker. There is a student council, too, as indicated by the above quote. But pupils mention these things infrequently and do not seem to identify with them. There is little question that most everyone's major concern is lessons, the main preoccupation is marks, and the goal is matriculation. In Coleman's terms, the value climate is monolithic and its theme is academic achievement. In this the school merely follows the public trend and parental pressure. Comments one of the younger "opinion leaders:"

> The general atmosphere in school: a factory for marks. Social activities are encouraged only in theory, while in practice they are not considered important. There is no understanding between teachers and pupils.

While the younger pupils would like to see more initiative in the direction of social activities on the part of teachers, the older ones appear resigned. They seek their pleasures elsewhere:

> Conditions of the school do not allow for social life. Experiments in this area do not succeed. The place for creating a social life is in the youth movements where conditions favor that kind of thing. (3)

Still, the picture is not altogether somber. There are individual differences within and between classes in the way extracurricular life is perceived. A classmate of the last-quoted youngster has this to say:

> There is a nice atmosphere in the class, but actual social life is very limited. The heavy study schedule simply does not make anything like that possible. Human relations are quite free, easy, and informal even if there are no organized activities of a social nature. Yet, the informal atmosphere in my class is more pleasant than in almost any other class of the school.

As mentioned before, whatever anyone's intentions, the structure of the curricula favors informal cohesiveness within classes, but presents planners of school-wide activities with considerable difficulty. The principal also blames the exigencies of matriculation for the single-minded pursuit of academic success. He points to the drop-off in youth movement membership, as pupils approach the final matriculation examinations in the 11th and 12th grades, to show that movements too, find it difficult to compete with the drive for matriculation.

The American reader must understand that social activities in Israeli schools are far less organized than in the United States. Aside from the curricular rigidity mentioned above we may search for reasons in the goals of educators. The acquisition of social skills is valued by few of them; extra-curricular activities, to the extent that they are valued at all, are thought to belong to the home and youth movement. The presence of club activities in Hillside actually presents a new trend, and their encouragement may in some measure be a result of American influence.

The principal and staff attach great importance to study habits and self-discipline. In the words of one teacher: "The goal of a high school is to promote intellectual growth and moral values." The research staff could not but be impressed with achievement in the area of self-restraint. Questionnaires were administered to entire grades at a time, and yet, there was no disturbance even in the absence of teachers. When a pupil had completed his task he quietly sat back and waited for all the others to finish. There was also excellent cooperation with interviewers. The often heard criticism of discourtesy among Israeli youth can not be advanced against Hillside pupils. Surely, the school must be given some credit for this.

The Jewish Subidentity

In this study we are mainly concerned with the Jewish subregion of ethnic identity. This does not imply that we consider the Israeli subregion unimportant, but simply, as our findings indicate, that the Jewish one is more problematic. Moreover, at the time this study was first planned, the general public felt sure of the Israeliness of its youth, far less sure of its Jewishness. Thus, the emphasis of our analysis reflects a public interest and our penchant for the problematic.

There is general agreement among teachers of Hillside High that values, both general and ethnic, are a sine qua non of "teaching and education." In the principal's view through "discipline of study" pupils will become an "elite of service." The perfect product of a school would be the citizen who maximizes his own potential and serves the nation where he is needed most. Other teachers are equally emphatic in their affirmation of education for values. "The question is not whether it is desirable to foster values; we simply must do this."

From transcripts of teachers' conferences it becomes clear that there is unanimity on the goal of strengthening the Jewishness of pupils' identity, but definitions and prescriptions vary widely. Some, for example, think of Jewishness as a feeling; others, a knowledge. Obviously, one does not go about communicating feeling the way one imparts knowledge. A woman advocate of feeling puts it this way:

> Jewish consciousness cannot be taught by logic. It is a matter of emotion. We must provide all kinds of experience, dramatizations, and activities.

Several teachers point out that the Jewish way of life used to be a very natural thing, a kind of conditioned reflex, something people did not have to think about at all. One puts this very effectively:

> Jewish consciousness is like a language. If you stop speaking it you forget it, even if it's your mother tongue. You can't teach a language by talking about it. That is why I don't teach grammar. The grammar of Judaism is not important. What we need is not the grammar of Judaism, but the practice.

He adds: "Values ought to be taught, but as by-products of the educational process. While there really is no instruction that is not in some sense educational as well, there is no direct way of teaching values." Though he mentions the practice of Judaism he is not sure of what practice. "A matter of trial and error."

Another teacher belongs to a smaller group to whom Judaism is not so much feeling or practice as knowledge and understanding. As he sees it: "The intellectual aspect is important.... If we know our history and understand our predicament we shall feel concern for our future." How does one get high school pupils to appreciate Jewish history? How does one help them to overcome a bias against what to them appears like an endless record of humiliation and persecutions? One teacher, often mentioned by his pupils as influential, provides some hints:

> I try to translate certain concepts into terms acceptable to them. Take bravery, a quality highly valued by our pupils. The War of Independence, the Army, the Suez Campaign, all these placed a premium on courage. So, in talking about Jewish martyrdom (Kiddush Hashem) during the Middle Ages I emphasize bravery rather than piety. Or, even at the risk of coloring history I play up the similarity in the histories of Jews and Non-Jews, not the differences: Knowing that our youngsters like the history of other peoples because of the many things done by them and sometimes dislike Jewish history because our people did not act enough I deemphasize deeds and spend more time on ideas thereby placing Jewish and General history on a common denominator.

He also points to one of the reasons for the negative attitudes of many pupils toward the past of their people:

> Zionism arose from a feeling of revolt against the past and the religious motives which permeated it. It is therefore quite understandable that the Jewish identity should have turned secular. Even the best of lessons cannot eradicate a feeling with historical roots of its own.

Some teachers are outspokenly pessimistic about education for values. One dismisses any efforts in that direction as barren:

> These kids are sated brats from the better part of town. Spiritual values are beyond them, and it is not surprising that all they see in Judaism is religious practice.

It appears to the observer that teachers are in a quandary. They have slipped into secularism, but have not developed a consistently secular point of view. From habit, conviction, sentiment, or even guilt they cling to various degrees of traditionalism which they would like to pass on to their young charges. As the years go by the teacher body is likely to develop a set of norms on the place of Jewishness, among other values, in the life of the school and in the curriculum. At present, individual teachers are stating issues and searching for answers.

To most teachers and to about half of the interviewed, Jewishness is, in so many paraphrases, a feeling. When pressed, some will add certain practical requirements, circumcision, for example, or – bar-mitzva (confirmation), the celebration of holidays, and the like, but with our interview sample these do not seem to be the heart of the matter. When asked what it means to be a "good Jew," a question that could easily call forth a list of do's and dont's, among 53 replies from 44 pupils, 31 mention feeling or belief, and only 15 specify certain prescribed customs. The feeling-first attitude is expressed by one young opinion leader:

> For a person to be Jewish it is enough that he feels Jewish. The religious practice of his fathers or his own are of superficial importance. A Jew is Jewish in his soul and sensations.

Teachers concur. Says one: "To be a Jew implies a sense of belonging to the Jewish people. Such a person known he belongs and wants to belong." Echoes a pupil: "To be a Jew, a person should think of himself as a Jew and want to be a Jew." It is difficult to know whether the pupil-teacher agreement on the nature of Jewishness indicates influence of teachers on pupils or merely expresses some common zeitgeist.

Affect thus is the common denominator of Jewishness. Teachers seem to feel that no matter how much time they devote to Jewish studies their success ultimately depends on the induction and contagion of feeling. Yet, a few worry that feelings may evaporate and sour into cynicism unless liberally fortified by knowledge and understanding. Indeed, there are signs of a weakening ethnic identity in the upper grades, as we shall detail below.

The principal, one of the most active forces on behalf of greater awareness of the Jewish heritage, spells out some of the things that Judaism means to him:

> I am certain there exists a Jewish world view that evolved through the centuries from out of the writings that accompanied our people and from the conditions in which they existed. To identify with this world view we must get to know the Bible, the Talmud, and the Jewish literature in its various stages. They will have to serve as our foundations... What is this world view? It is the preference for the spiritual over the materialistic, of the truly permanent over the

> evanescent. True, this view appears in the literature of other peoples as well, but as a consistent and dominant theme, in my opinion, it marks the literature of the Jewish people.

This statement goes beyond feeling and stops short of ritualism. Indeed, the principal has developed a reasoned position that may be called Jewish humanism. He finds that a large number of pupil voices are responsive to his call. He cites having been approached by several of his brightest upper graders who wanted to know why so much time is given to alien subjects like English and so little to Talmud which is, after all "our own."

There is a suggestion in the interview protocols that secular subjects tend to talk about the Jewish people or nation when they wish to involve themselves and about the Jewish religion when they wish to detach themselves. It makes sense that someone will choose his definitions to serve his needs and dispositions. Explains one pupil: "As someone who does not believe I prefer to think of the Jews as a people."

The Jewish subidentity, as it emerges from the opinions of these teachers and pupils is grounded in some knowledge of the Jewish heritage, its history, literature, and customs. Also it is expected to be suffused with active feelings from that heritage. There is not, on the other hand, any insistence on religious practices and beliefs. To be a Jew is to feel a Jew.

Perceived Influences

How do pupils get to feel the way they do? What influences account for the state of their Jewish and Israeli subidentities? In asking them what they perceive to be the influences affecting them we stress the subjective experiences of those at whom information is directed rather than the intentions of the influencing agents.

In Table 1 we have tabulated the within-school factors that are mentioned by 44 pupil interviewees as having influenced their Jewish subidentity. Close to 50 per cent of the mentions concern formal factors such as lessons, teachers, and class discussions. Semi-formal and informal influences are less prominent, as our review of the school atmosphere would lead us to suspect. Among subjects held to have the greatest impact on ethnic identity History, Bible, and Literature head the list (Table 1, lower part). The prominence of History for this sample may be a tribute to the teachers of the subject, but it is possible that the subject has some intrinsic prominence in this context.

Turning to perceived influences in general, both within and outside the school, we should like to begin with a summary of replies to a question that asked interviewees to rank all of the influences that seemed to bear on their Jewish subidentity (Table 2). In the lower part of Table 2 ranks have been weighted to yield single scores. It is a close race between home and school, with the home carrying off most of the first ranks. The strong showing of books - generally, required reading - is significant as books were not specifically mentioned in the interview.

Let us review the major sources of influence perceived by pupils, beginning with the school and moving outward to home and youth movement.

TABLE 1

Opinions concerning Influences on Jewish Identity

N (Interviewees = 44
n (Opinions) = 100*

Influences	Mentions
Formal	48 (48.0%)
Lessons	18
Teachers	20
Class Discussions	10
Semi-formal	18 (18.0%)
Special Events, Symposia, etc.	6
Clubs	3
Ceremonies	6
Parties	3
Informal	22 (22.0%)
General Atmosphere	7
Private Talks	15
No Influence	11 (11.0%)
Total	100 (100.0%)
Subjects	
History, Jewish and General	24
Bible	14
Literature	12
Talmud	6
Others	9
Total	65

* Note: The average interviewee made two mentions

TABLE 2

Hierarchy of Perceived Influences on Jewish Identity

N = 44

	Mentions of				
Rank	Home	School	Books	Youth Mvt. and Peers	Mass Media
1	24	11	6	1	1
2	4	15	9	8	9
3	5	5	13	8	7
4		4	5	4	7
5	1	1	3	3	3
6				2	

Note: Subjects made more than one mention

WEIGHTED SCORES

Category	Score*
Home	186
School	175
Books	154
Mass Media	106
Youth Movement and Peers	98

* Weights: Rank 1 = 6...... Rank 6 = 1.

The School. - We have seen that teachers are interested in encouraging the growth of individual and ethnic values. Through activities organized by the school and through the curriculum they attempt to "teach for education." How is their influence perceived by pupils? Do youngsters know that someone is trying to impart values to them? Yes and no. It appears that there is little recognition of a school-wide effort of a "general atmosphere" with respect to values. At the same time, wide credit is given to individual teachers. Here is one typical comment by an eleventh grader:

> The main influence of the school is in the way individual teachers explain their lessons; there is nothing that could be called a 'general atmosphere.'

What has so often been found before appears here again in comment after comment: the crux of education is the confrontation between teacher and pupil. 4) Here is the opinion of one pupil:

> Actually, every good teacher influences his pupils, but good teachers are not good merely because they know how to teach, but because of the kind of persons they are.

And of another:

> Our class teacher influences us because of his personality, his method of teaching, and his readiness to talk to everyone. There is general agreement with what he says. Everybody likes him.

One also gets a picture of how and why some teachers manage to add to the Jewish identity of some of their pupils. Witness this opinion:

> The Talmud teacher succeeds in making his subject popular by the excellence of his explanations, the sharpness of his side comments, and most of all by the strong and evident liking for what he teaches.

A younger pupil recognizes the efforts of the school in a more general way:

> The school tries to influence us in Jewish matters. The principal, in particular, tries to exert influence. So do some of the other teachers. Only, they don't succeed too well.

Pupils seem to resist persuasion that is too obvious:

> I don't like teachers who will spend half a class period haranguing us on the absolute need to believe in God. The school should give us a chance to form our own opinions.

Or,

> The history teacher, in a lesson on the Middle Ages, tried with all his might to get us to identify with Jews of that period. He hardly succeeded.

Some of the teachers we interviewed, too, assign priority to the weight of reasonableness in informal discussion. They seem to be just as afraid of exerting obvious influence as the children are of receiving it. Education works best when it seems least like education.

There are some pupils who claim that neither school nor teachers have any influence on their value system whatsoever. One youngster is vehement in his disclaimer:

> School does not influence me in the least, not even in Jewish matters. I form my opinions outside of school. School for me is a place to obtain my matriculation certificate.

Should one conclude from this that he is really uninfluenced by the school, or rather that the influence is unfelt, or that it is such as to make him wish to deny it, or even that the denial of influence is some kind of norm among at least a segment of pupils (See, for example, Table 1). Looking at the statement in a different way, one may recognize the salience of the one supreme value: academic achievement. ("School for me is a place to obtain my matriculation certificate") . The curious thing about this value is that it is seldom mentioned as such. It is so much there that it is simply taken for granted.

When pupils are asked about a more specific "Jewish" atmosphere in school opinions differ. Much seems to depend on what they expect. A girl from a traditional home says:

> The general atmosphere leans toward Jewishness. At public ceremonies Jewish issues are raised, symposia are held, the value of Judaism is emphasized at discussions in class, and before holidays. I like all this.

Another pupil reports the same facts but reacts differently:

> Every festival is reported in school. They always try to bring in traditional content, but the school fails to give equal emphasis to the national aspect of a holiday.

This comment points to one of the special problems of the Zionist revival, how to secularize tradition so as to make it acceptable to all, how to broaden a religious holiday into a national one. The dilemma is reflected in the comment of one girl who calls herself anti-religious:

> The atmosphere in school can be divided into two parts. One, what teachers would like. Two, what there actually is. And that is not at all Jewish, but Israeli.

While a majority of pupils assign influence to individual teachers only a third avow that the school, as an institution, makes an effort in the direction of Jewishness. Others mention ceremonies, symposia, trips to museums commemorating the holocaust of modern Jewry, and the like, but they do not seem to recognize in these events anything but simple elements of the curriculum. Here may be a sign of Hillside's success. After all, the benefit of an educational influence is not necessarily contingent on its being recognized as such.

Within the peer group the Jewish topic arises mainly as an accompaniment to lessons. One pupil who thinks of himself as a leader draws this picture:

> There are four pupils in my class who are considered to be opinion leaders; every project is initiated by them. They exert influence on Jewish matters, too, but on these their opinions are divided. Two of them, including myself, are very much opposed to anything Jewish while the other two are in favor. This comes out during debates with the history teacher, when the latter two side with him and against us. There is in the class also a large group of indifferent types who will agree with anyone who happened to speak to them last. I have no respect for them at all.

There is the silent kind of influence, too. Tells one tenth grader:

> There is one religious girl in our class. The very fact that she is there restrains the otherwise anti-religious atmosphere.

Clearly, the presence of religious pupils has a moderating influence.

A curious aspect of peer group influences is the prevailing impression among pupils that their classmates have attitudes toward Jewishness more negative than they do themselves or than the facts warrant. Interviewees were asked what they considered to be the opinion of their classmates toward Jews in the Diaspora, Jewish history, religious people, religion, and tradition. Of 95 comments only 21 can be called imputations of favorable attitudes. One such comment is quite picturesque:

> There are many nincompoops in my class who think that all religious Jews are Neturei Karta fanatics. They don't make any distinction between religious people and religion, and seem to think therefore that every Jew has a streimel[5] on his head and a torah scroll in his hand. The beautiful customs, the festivals, the traditional foods, the things that make for the true character of Judaism, all are forgotten.

The gloomy perception of hostility and indifference appears exaggerated. Research workers were impressed with the serious and sympathetic interest Hillsiders showed toward the topics on which they were questioned. During a classroom discussion with one of the eleventh grade classes the drift of opinion was favorable toward an intensification of Jewish studies. An almost unanimous vote at the end ("Who would like to see more attention to Jewish awareness in the curriculum?") confirmed this impression. Questionnaire statistics, to be reported below, though not likely to fire the enthusiast, do not point to a collapse of Jewish identity.

The Home. - Thirty interviewees were questioned about the Jewish atmosphere in their homes. One of them described his home as religious, five as traditional, the others as non-religious. One among the last mentioned called her home anti-religious.

It seems that even in non-religious homes there are many vestiges of ceremonial Judaism. If often took some probing to discover that candles are lit on the sabbath, that the seder is celebrated in some form, nd that the rules of kashrut (food prescriptions) are partly observed, sometimes in honor of a grandparent. Tells one:

> My parents do not go to synagogue services. They are not believers. The home atmosphere is not traditional. Oh, yes, we do have a seder, we light candles on channukah (the festival of lights) and sometimes before the Sabbath, too.

The following comment by a recent immigrant from Eastern Europe gives some notion of how life in the Jewish State may in some instances level the salience of the Jewish subidentity:

> At home there is no Jewish atmosphere. The home is secular, the sabbath festive, but not in any Jewish way. This year we lit channukah candles once, on the occasion of a visit by relatives. On pessach we have a seder when we happen to have traditionally-minded guests. The rest of the holidays, nothing. My parents do not go to synagogue services. - In Poland things were different. Most of our friends were Jewish, and there was something special about a holiday.

Is he saying that most of his friends here are not Jewish? Of course not; they are. In Israel his Jewishness does not stand out because nothing in his environment contrasts with it or marks it off.

For 23 out of the 30 the home did not make any special efforts at inducing feelings about Jewishness. Only one perceived a determined effort at indoctrination on the part of her father:

> My father tried to influence me in every possible way to feel Jewish. He used to be a rabbi, and that was a source of pride to him. But I really don't pay much attention to him.

Pupils have real difficulty in recognizing influences that they know must exist. It is possible that a few "repress" whatever influence there was. It is more likely that influences are so subtle and pervasive and that homes, like teachers, are so informal about them that pupils have real objective difficulty of making them out. One, a budding psychologist, it would seem, makes these observations:

> My parents' influence came to me unconsciously. They did not try to influence me, but the atmosphere they created did so anyway. To take an example, my father enjoys liturgical chants, and I began to like them too though most of my friends dislike them very much.

The majority of interviewees regard themselves in agreement with their parents on matters of Judaism, but there are a few rebels, too. Says one:

> When I was young I used to swallow everything that I was fed. Now that I begin to be more independent in my thinking I see that I have opinions quite a bit different from my parents! I certainly don't feel like retreating from mine.

Lack of home influence raises the relative weight of school influence in some cases. We learn from one girl:

> My first influence was my home, but since we do not practice religion I did not develop any interest in Judaism. In school the things I learned helped me form an initial interest in the Bible. Then, the biblical passages recited before the 8:30 p.m. news caught my attention, and the accompanying commentary interested me more and more.

Youth Movement. - All of the youth movements engage their members in a wide variety of recreational activities, some of which are intellectual in kind. Talks, discussions, readings, and leadership courses range over many topics; foremost among them are obligations toward self and community. Pride in Israel, its accomplishments and aspirations, find their expression in talks about the War of Independence, the Sinai Campaign, the Army, the pioneering settlements and others. In comparison, the world of Jewish concern seems to play a minor role, at least in the secular movements to which almost all of the Hillside pupils belong. The influence of the youth movement appears to have its major impact on the Israeli subidentity.

Scouts, who are the majority, claim that their movement is liberal and shuns involvement in matters of religion and tradition. "We don't touch them; the movement has no clear position on Judaism," says one. "We are tolerant toward tradition and religion," says another.

But lectures by representatives of the League Against Religious Repression, discussions on relations with Jews in other countries ("We are for them"), and cooperation with the American Young Judea are mentioned. A girl member of the leftist Hashomer Hatzair objects to the negative attitude adopted by her movement toward religion and tradition:

> I am opposed to our policy of contempt for religious people and can't go along with it. I think it is good to believe in something, and people should not be judged by their faith. I respect tradition.

One half of the interviewees claim that their movement does not try to influence them in matters of Jewish tradition or religion:

> The youth movement does not stress Jewish matters, and therefore does not influence us.... The movement relies on the school and its history lessons. The movement does not educate the way the school does.

There is then a kind of mutual adaptation between school home and movement. Each has its role, and each tacitly expects the other to fulfill that role and not encroach upon its own.

Opinion Leaders

Among pupils interviewed were 16 who had been selected on the basis of sociometric choices. They were high in rank among those "who seem to have an influence on the class." They came from most classes between the 9th and 11th grades. We called them opinion leaders.

It is, of course, difficult to know in which sense these pupils are considered influential by their classmates, but from their own reports it appears that such influence as they have does not include Jewish matters. Several of them say that they rarely discuss the topic with their peers and cannot imagine how they might have influenced them. This conclusion is borne out when opinion leaders' attitudes are compared with those of other opinion leaders in the same classes and with classmates in general. There just does not seem to be a pattern of relation.

Comparing opinion leaders with other interviewees one discovers a very similar profile of opinion. Again, it would seem that Jewish topics are not publicly discussed enough to make them a part of public opinion on which leaders might lead any one. Their orientation is not any less or more Jewish, and if they have any influence it must be in a very indirect way. Their influence is possibly greatest in matters that are left relatively unattended by the school, that is, social activity. This is supported by the contention of six among the leaders that they try to guide their classmates in social matters. Says one of the six:

> I try to influence others in matters of social life, organization, and a little in studies, too. Almost never in Jewish matters, mainly because we hardly ever talk about these.

Four others discuss Jewish topics and try to make their influence felt, two for and two against. One argues against a God who "demands sacrifices as the God of Israel does." She is not sure about success in this. Almost all the others claim to have some influence in varied matters "from music to Arabs." A majority of nine specifically denies interest or influence in Jewishness.

On the face of interview records, opinion leaders are an articulate and intelligent bunch. This is as one would expect in a school that places such high stress on academic achievement. Also, all but three of the sixteen are active members of youth movements, often mention the ideology of national service to which youth movements subscribe. Explains one:

> I don't try to influence anyone in Jewish matters, but there are many other things that bother me. The very fact that I am a member of a youth movement makes me wish to fight those who belong to the 'salon society' and to urge them toward membership in the movement.

All of them identify strongly with Israel and are sure of their identity as Israelis. None deny their Jewishness, but few regard it as a challenge or would wish the school to devote more time to it.

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

While interviews were conducted with only a sample of eleventh graders and of "opinion leaders" a questionnaire was administered twice to all pupils from the eighth to the 12th grades. The analysis of questionnaire returns contains a brief review of returns, a consideration of reliability and a number of comparisons: 1) between grades; 2) between test administrations; 3) between individuals in the 11th grade who had been exposed to varying amounts of interview activity.

The questionnaire was adapted from the instrument used in the survey study of 11th grades. The questions retained were the ones that had shown the strongest relations to the variables of the study. The slightly different versions of the pre- and post- test are presented in appendices A and B in English translation.

We shall briefly describe the variables of the questionnaire. They may be divided into self-variables and cognitive variables. Self variables refer to the personal meaning that ethnic identity has for respondents. Cognitive variables refer to opinions on identity-related issues that do not commit the individual in any direct personal way.

Self Variables:

1. Self definition; or, how a person places himself on a number of seven-step continua (Jewish-Israeli; Jewish-Private Person; Israeli-Private Person).

2. Centrality of Jewishness; or, the importance a person attaches to his being a Jew.

3. Centrality of Israeliness.

4. Valence of Jewishness; or, the readiness with which a person accepts his being a Jew.

5. Consonance; or, the association a person perceives between his being a Jew and an Israeli.

6. Identification; or, the empathy one experiences with Jews in other countries.

7. Closeness; or, the closeness one feels toward different categories of Jews.

Cognitive Variables:

1. Similarity among Jews; or, the degree to which Jews are perceived to be similar.

2. Similarity among Israelis; or, the degree to which Israelis are perceived to be similar.

3. Interdependence among Jews; or, the extent to which Jews share a common fate and are dependent on one another.

4. Interdependence among Israelis.

5. Responsibility; or, the obligation incurred by the State of Israel toward Jews in other countries.

A further variable in a class all by itself is salience. Salience literally is the visibility of an object against the ground from which it stands out. In the context of identity one may ask how salient is the Israeli and/or Jewish subidentity on the ground of total identity. The very first question on the questionnaire is an endeavor to measure salience. Appendix E presents an analysis of returns.

Self Variables: Table 3 summarizes percentage distributions of self variables for all subjects. Data are given for both test administrations and called before and after. The over all impression leaves no doubt that the Israeli subidentity of these youngsters is stronger than its Jewish counterpart. This becomes apparent on the very first continuum of self-definition, where Israeli and Jew are placed at opposite ends. It should be pointed out that this contraposition is somewhat artificial, really, because the necessity of deciding between these two positions seldom arises. In fact, 26 per cent before and 28 per cent after resolve the conflict by placing themselves into the middle category. It is difficult to know whether this means that they regard themselves as both Israelis and Jews to the same extent or that the confrontation is insoluble or meaningless. Also, in view of the high degree of consonance to be noted in Table 3 one should interpret the first self-definition with some caution.

Anyway, only 8 per cent before and 6 per cent after place themselves on the Jewish side of the Israeli-Jewish continuum. Again, when their ethnic identity is placed opposite their private identity (Jew-Private Person, Israeli-Private Person), the Israeli subidentity presents the stronger competition than does the Jewish subidentity.

To 44 per cent (53 per cent) it is "very important" to be Israelis; for only 8 per cent (8 per cent), to be Jews. Israeliness is thus more "central" a fact of life than Jewishness. Yet, Jewishness is not totally peripheral. Only 5 per cent (4 per cent) claim it to be of no importance.

Valence is here operationalized as a readiness to live one's life over again outside the State of Israel. 55 per cent (47 per cent) state such readiness. Whether this is little or much surely depends on one's expectations. If valence were measured by a readiness to be born again a Jew in Israel percentages would undoubtedly rise.

Consonance has been rendered as a tendency for Jewish and Israeli feelings to vary together. 64 per cent of respondents on the before-test and 58 per cent on the after-test experience consonance in this sense; there is harmony between the Jewish and Israeli regions of their identity. Only 4 per cent before (3 per cent after) feel that their feelings of Jewishness and Israeliness are inversely related, that one goes up when the other goes down. This leaves about one third with the opinion that Jewishness is independent of Israeliness.

As to identification with insult to Jews in other countries, 6 per cent (2 per cent) declare themselves unmoved by the insults a hypothetical foreign newspaper might heap on Jews abroad. About two thirds claim they would "always" or "often" be affected by such events. An interesting sidelight on identification is apparent in returns to two questions that were added to the post test. Pupils were asked to agree or disagree

TABLE 3

SELF VARIABLES

$\underline{N}$ (Fall '65) = 486 Before	$\underline{N}$ (Spring '66) = 431 After

Self-Definition

Israeli	Before	17	20	30	26	4	2	2	% **Jew**
	After	10	23	33	28	4	1	1	
Jew	Before	11	10	15	19	21	12	13	% **Private Person**
	After	7	6	14	20	26	18	10	
Israeli	Before	21	16	25	23	9	3	4	% **Private Person**
	After	18	15	22	25	12	6	1	

Centrality

Jewishness	Israeliness
Q: Does your being Jewish play an important role in your life?	Q: Does your being Israeli play an important role in your life?

Before	After		Before	After
8	8	Very important	44	53
50	46	Important	50	42
37	42	Little importance	5	5
5	4	No importance	1	0
100%	100%		100%	100%

Valence

Q: If you were to live your life over again in another country, would you want to be born a Jew?

Before	After	
55	47	Yes
27	37	Doesn't matter
18	16	No
100%	100%	

To be continued

TABLE 3

(continued)

Consonance

Whenever my feelings of being Jewish become stronger, my feelings of being Israeli –

Before	After	
64	58	Also become stronger
32	39	Are unaffected
4	3	Become weaker
100%	100%	

Identification with Insult

Q: When an important foreign newspaper offends Jews in other countries, do you feel as if you had been insulted?

Before	After	
24	29	Always
43	47	Often
27	22	Seldom
6	2	Never
100%	100%	

Closeness

Q: How much closeness do you feel toward –

	Religious Jews abroad ?		Non-Religious Jews abroad?		Religious Jews in Israel?	
	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Very great closeness	6	3	2	3	3	3
Great closeness	17	13	14	11	18	11
Middling closeness	37	33	44	37	37	38
Little closeness	25	25	27	31	29	29
Very little closeness	15	27	14	17	12	19
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

with two statements: 1. Every Jew should feel as if he had been himself saved from the holocaust of Nazi Germany. 2. I feel personally as if I had been saved from the holocaust. 49 per cent replied that every Jew should identify, but only 34 per cent admit to identifying themselves. Clearly, the norm is greater than personal feeling.

Cognitive Variables: Table 4 contains results on the three cognitive variables of the study, similarity, interdependence, and mutual responsibility. Similarity and interdependence are principles of categorization of which the second is more sophisticated than the first. In fact, results show that Jews are considered "very similar" by only 6 per cent (3 per cent) of respondents, but "almost always" interdependent by 37 per cent (30 per cent). Israelis are considered more similar in characteristics and behavior than Jews, but both are equally interdependent. The fact that interdependence is not tied to territorial concentration would seem to show its higher level of abstraction as a concept.

The notion of mutual responsibility includes both cognition and action tendency. 39 per cent (37 per cent) do not restrict the obligation of the State of Israel toward foreign Jews in any way. As few as 4 per cent (4 per cent) think that no help ought to be extended.

Test Retest Reliability

The two questionnaire administrations in the fall of 1965 and the spring of 1966 offered the possibility of estimating reliability by correlating scores between the two test occasions. It may be expected that

TABLE 4

COGNITIVE VARIABLES

N (Fall '65) - 486 Before	N (Spring '66) - 431 After

Similarity among

Jews	Israelis
Q: Are Jews similar in characteristics and behavior?	Q: Are Israelis similar in characteristics and behavior?

Jews Before	Jews After		Israelis Before	Israelis After
6	3	Very similar	17	12
32	41	Similar	47	53
43	38	Very little similar	28	25
19	19	Dissimilar	8	10
100%	100%		100%	100%

Interdependence among

Jews	Israelis
Q: When the reputation of some Jews in the world suffers, does this hurt other Jews?	Q: When the reputation of some Israelis in the world suffers, does this hurt other Israelis?

Jews Before	Jews After		Israelis Before	Israelis After
37	30	Almost always	35	33
39	51	Often	40	45
20	17	Seldom	17	18
4	2	Almost never	7	4
100%	100%		100%	100%

Mutual Responsibility

Q: Should the State of Israel help Jews in foreign countries when they are in need of help?

Before	After	
39	37	Yes, under all circumstances
46	44	Yes, on condition that such aid will not hurt State seriously
11	14	Yes, on condition that such aid will not hurt State at all
4	4	No.
100%	99%	

time lapse and research activity would keep test retest reliability at moderate levels at best, but also that differences among variables would reflect their relative stability.

It is significant, therefore, that Pearson *r*'s and gamma's 6) are higher for self variables than for cognitive ones. For self variables the overall mean *r* is .47 (*gamma:* .59). For cognitive variables the corresponding means are .32 and .41. Thus, Table 5 leads us to conclude that reliabilities are moderate, but that those of self variables exceed those of cognitive ones. Here, then, is empirical support for the validity of distinguishing between the two kinds of variables. The former, being more central to the personality, are the more stable and/or the better remembered.

Group Comparisons

1. *Between grades*. Some of the most interesting findings of the study have to do with age trends. We have noted (Table 3) that the Israeli subidentity in this *secular* school is stronger than the Jewish subidentity. Now we find that both undergo a gradual decline through adolescence, at least in this school.

In Table 6 mean scores before and after have been tabulated by variables and grades. In the column marked "scoring" the key to scores is indicated. High *centrality*, for example, or the assignment of great importance to one's being a Jew (Israeli) is scored *1*; low centrality, *4*. In general, low scores indicate high identity. The questions

TABLE 5

RELIABILITY
TEST-RETEST CORRELATION

Variable		Measure	Grade					
			8	9	10	11	12	All
		N	72	132	116	69	19	408
Self-Definition	Isr-Jew	r	23	37	61	65	67	46
		gamma	38	42	67	69	73	53
	Jew-Pvt.Per.	r	50	52	49	53	72	54
		gamma	56	51	47	50	71	52
	Isr-Pvt.Per.	r	34	42	48	48	22	43
		gamma	41	47	49	45	20	46
Centrality	Jewishness	r						
		gamma						
	Israeliness	r	52	26	37	39	26	37
		gamma	73	51	56	72	41	59
Valence		r	61	51	61	51	76	58
		gamma	86	72	77	71	93	77
Consonance		r	51	39	47	35	50	43
		gamma	78	65	77	58	85	70
Identification		r	41	55	43	69	47	52
		gamma	52	71	57	84	58	67
Closeness to	Relig. Jews abroad	r	40	41	44	61	69	51
		gamma	45	47	50	64	77	46
	Non-rel. Jews abroad	r	24	25	39	55	28	34
		gamma	26	30	48	73	18	41
	Relig. Jews in Israel	r	33	48	56	56	65	51
		gamma	41	55	66	66	77	60
Similarity in	Behavior of Jews	r	39	22	34	15	30	28
		gamma	50	27	43	23	42	36
	Behavior of Israelis	r	48	14	36	28	12	30
		gamma	60	19	43	35	26	38
Interdependence	Jews	r	17	37	43	39	-02	35
		gamma	24	50	52	47	-14	45
	Israelis	r	34	31	42	48	29	37
		gamma	41	35	57	60	56	46
Mutual Responsibility		r	28	43	20	37	-26	30
		gamma	32	51	26	52	-32	38

Note: Decimal points have been omitted throughout.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES BY GRADES EIGHT TO TWELVE

Variable	Scoring	Test Given	Grade 8	9	10	11	12	All
		Before N	76	142	130	78	35	461
		After N	76	138	123	76	21	434
Self-Definition	Israeli:1	Before	3.12	2.71	3.16	2.87	2.61	2.93
	Jewish:7	After	2.86	2.91	3.12	3.00	2.75	2.97
	Jewish:1	Before	3.36	4.01	4.12	4.83	5.09	4.16
	Pvt. Prs:7	After	3.66	4.68	4.34	4.93	4.79	4.45
	Israeli:1	Before	2.61	3.01	2.94	3.37	4.40	3.09
	Pvt. Prs:7	After	2.82	3.32	3.11	3.45	3.76	3.22
Jewish Centrality	Hi 1	Before	2.22	2.39	2.35	2.53	2.63	2.39
		After	2.28	2.51	2.38	2.40	2.62	2.42
Israeli Centrality	Lo 3	Before	1.65	1.63	1.61	1.56	1.86	1.63
		After	1.57	1.60	1.51	1.30	1.76	1.52
Valence of Jewishness	Hi 1	Before	1.49	1.65	1.59	1.60	2.11	1.63
	Lo 3	After	1.49	1.72	1.61	1.79	2.19	1.68
Consonance	Hi 1	Before	1.31	1.45	1.33	1.42	1.60	1.41
	Lo 3	After	1.40	1.52	1.41	1.43	1.45	1.45
Identification	Hi 1	Before	2.01	2.20	2.10	2.10	2.49	2.16
	Lo 4	After	1.91	2.01	1.88	2.05	2.25	1.97
Closeness to Rel. Jews		Before	3.03	3.17	3.24	3.40	3.97	3.26
Abroad	Hi 1	After	3.64	3.55	3.62	3.49	4.00	3.60
N-Rel.		Before	3.51	3.24	3.50	3.24	3.54	3.38
Jews Ab.	Lo 5	After	3.37	3.42	3.63	3.43	3.48	3.48
Rel. Jews		Before	3.05	3.25	3.17	3.58	3.74	3.29
Isr.		After	3.35	3.57	3.35	3.74	3.67	3.50
Similarity Jews	Hi 1	Before	2.68	2.64	2.73	2.87	2.97	2.74
		After	2.79	2.70	2.63	2.76	2.90	2.72
Israelis	Lo 4	Before	2.33	2.20	2.25	2.38	2.29	2.27
		After	2.36	2.27	2.31	2.39	2.48	2.33
Interdependence Jews	Hi 1	Before	1.88	1.92	1.92	2.01	1.69	1.91
		After	1.97	1.93	1.79	2.03	1.90	1.91
Israelis	Lo 4	Before	2.05	2.03	2.00	1.79	1.74	1.97
		After	2.21	1.93	1.86	1.89	1.60	1.94
Mutual Responsibility	Hi 1	Before	1.55	1.93	1.71	1.86	2.00	1.80
	Lo 4	After	1.81	1.89	1.90	1.83	1.70	1.86

that served to operationalize the variables are not repeated. The reader is referred to Table 3 or to Appendices A and B if he wishes to ascertain the full question.

The clearest trend appears for the Jewish-Private Person and the Israeli-Private Person continua. In both, the between-means F ratio exceeds 14 and is highly significant ($p < .01$). As pupils get older they increasingly think of themselves as private persons rather than as Jews or Israelis. None of the other between-means variances are significant, but both before and after, there is a fairly clear decline on centrality of Jewishness, identification, and closeness to religious Jews in Israel. Even valence points more down than up. It may be noted that all of these belong to the class we have called self-variables and here is further evidence for their relatively greater stability. Trends will not show up unless measures are at least moderately reliable; the fact that they do not show up on cognitive variables does not, of course, warrant the conclusion that there are none.

The likelihood of a trend on the ethnic identity is most clearly suggested by the fact that in 23 out of 30 relevant comparisons (the Israeli-Jewish continuum is irrelevant) the 12th grade mean shows a weaker ethnic identity than the 8th grade mean. In fact, if it were not for the 12th grade it might be somewhat risky to speak of trends at all, since there are several reversals in the lower grades.

The variable of interdependence shows an opposite trend in that Israelis are seen to become more interdependent and Jews at least not less interdependent with the age of raters. It may be the sophistication mentioned before that shows through on interdependence among Israelis, older respondents having more of this quality than younger ones. In judging interdependence among Jews sophistication may become confounded with declining Jewishness so that the net result is an uncertain trend.

The relative strength of the Israeli and Jewish subidentities as reflected in the Israeli-Jewish continuum of self-identity is a struggle between contendents both of whom weaken at approximately the same rate. As a result the trend line is mixed. Yet, even here toward the 12th grade Israeliness appears stronger than Jewishness. Though both lose out to private status the Jewish subidentity may lose out the least bit more.

Restating the findings of Table 6 we may say that as Hillside teenagers get older they tend to define themselves less as Israelis and Jews and more as Private Persons, it becomes less important to them to be Jews, they become less ready to identify with Jews insulted in foreign newspapers, and they fell less close to religious Jews in Israel. In sum, there is a weakening of several of the elements singled out by us to mark ethnic identity.

Teachers acknowledge this and have explanations to account for it. One feels that older pupils turn inward and become more preoccupied with their own future and their own problems. Another reason that the heavy stress on the emotional and sentimental appeal in teaching for ethnic and national values backfires in the upper grades. If the appeal were more rational, he thinks, it would stand a better chance against the developing sense of criticism. These and similar lines of thought see attitudes toward the Israeli and Jewish self in the context of adolescent development.

Pupils, who also acknowledge that a decline in ethnic identity checks with their observations, more often than teachers point to curricular content as the central cause. As far as they recall, elementary school stressed the Jewish heritage much more than does the secondary school. They note the widening sweep of subject matter which must of needs leave ethnic values in more limited perspective. Here then we have an explanation in terms of what the school does or does not do. Future studies might test hypotheses on changes in ethnic identity derived from theories of adolescent development or curricular content, or some combination of both.

2. Between questionnaire administrations. Very little can be concluded from mean differences between test administrations. If there is an age trend shown in the previous section, end-of-year means should be consistent with it. All we can conclude from the last column of Table 7 is that by and large they are not inconsistent. Before-after differences in means are small and not significant statistically. The

time between test administrations may have been too short for age trends to appear. In addition, it is not altogether unlikely that research activity, mainly interviewing and test administration, confounded the usual age trend. In the next section we shall find that there is some evidence for such an effect.

3. Between individuals of the eleventh grade. All of the interviews in the 11th grade took place in the first and third classes. A number of results are probably if the activity of interviewing had any effect: a) the eleventh grade as a whole might change differently from the other grades; b) the first and third classes might change differently from the second; c) the individuals interviewed in the eleventh grade might change differently from those not interviewed. The rationale for an effect of research activity, in particular of interviewing, is that raising unfamiliar questions sets off communication and may bring about attitude change by way of social forces operating in classes. Let us examine the evidence on the three hypothesized effects.

a) If we return to Table 6 and compare the before-after changes in the 11th grade with those of other grades we cannot discover the hint of any differential change. What changes there are can best be explained by age trends. We have no grounds for the position that the eleventh grade as a whole was affected by research activity.

b) In Table 7 mean scores have been tabulated for the three classes of the 11th grade. Only self variables are employed in view of their greater

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES AMONG ELEVENTH GRADES

Variable	Scoring		Test Given	I	II	III	All
				Classes			
			Total N	35	24	19	78
			(Interviewed	20		9	29)
				Mean Scores			
	Israeli	1	Before	2.83	2.67	3.21	2.87
	Jewish	7	After	2.78	3.09	3.35	3.00
Self-Definition	Jew	1	Before	5.09	4.88	4.32	4.83
	Pvt. Prs	7	After	5.39	4.83	4.12	4.93
	Israeli	1	Before	3.66	3.00	3.32	3.37
	Pvt. Prs	7	After	3.68	3.57	2.82	3.45
Jewish			Before	2.63	2.46	2.42	2.53
Centrality	Hi	1	After	2.46	2.48	2.18	2.40
	Lo	4	Before	1.60	1.50	1.56	1.56
Israeli			After	1.27	1.39	1.24	1.30
Valence	Hi	1	Before	1.68	1.67	1.51	1.60
	Lo	3	After	1.89	1.73	1.65	1.79
Consonance	Hi	1	Before	1.40	1.58	1.26	1.42
	Lo	3	After	1.41	1.52	1.35	1.43
Identification	Hi	1	Before	2.41	2.50	1.89	2.19
	Lo	3	After	2.08	2.17	1.82	2.05
Closeness to religious			Before	3.37	3.38	3.47	3.40
Jews in other countries			After	3.54	3.61	3.24	3.49
	Hi	1					
Closeness to non-rel.			Before	3.23	3.54	2.89	3.24
Jews in other countries			After	3.46	3.70	3.00	3.43
	Lo	5					
Closeness to religious			Before	3.69	3.42	3.58	3.58
Jews in Israel			After	3.97	3.43	3.65	3.74

reliability. There are seven changes in a favorable direction in the third class, four in the second, and three in the first. If we recall that interviews took place in the first and third classes we have no grounds for claiming a differential effect in the classes in which interviews took place.

c) In Table 8 mean scores are listed for the Jewish self variables since they can be expected to be most sensitive to any possible interview effect. Among the six comparisons four show that interviewees became relatively less unfavorable on Jewish identity variables than non-interviewees in the two classes where interviews were conducted. Specifically: the net loss incurred by interviewees on self-definition (Jew-Private Person) is smaller (-.06) than for non-interviewees (-.28). The same holds for valence; a net loss of -.16 as against a net loss of -.32. On identification a positive gain is greater for interviewees, or .17 as against .08, and on closeness to religious Jews in Israel a gain of .08 is set against a loss of -.56. Centrality of Jewishness and consonance run counter to the trend. In the case of centrality both groups gain, but the gain for non-interviewees (.26) is slightly greater than for interviewees (.13). It is tempting to speculate that initial position has something to do with this. Non-interviewees are lower at the outset. In fact, the final mean for interviewees remains the higher of the two. Consonance behaves perversely. Interviewees lose and non-interviewees gain. The possibility should not be ruled out that the finer discriminations that some interviewees may have learned to make between the Jewish and Israeli subidentities led them to what appears like lower consonance, but is really greater discrimination.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON BETWEEN INTERVIEWEES AND NON-INTERVIEWEES IN ELEVENTH GRADE

Variables relevant to Jewish Identity

Variable	Scoring	Test Given		Int.	Non Int.	Int.	Non Int.
			N	29	25	29	25
				Mean Scores		Net favorable or unfavorable change	
Self-Definition	Jewish	1 Before		4.69	4.96	-.06	-.28
	Pvt. P	7 After		4.75	5.24		
Centrality of Jewishness	Hi	1 Before		2.45	2.68	.13	.26
	Lo	4 After		2.32	2.42		
Valence	Hi	1 Before		1.55	1.60	-.16	-.32
	Lo	3 After		1.71	1.92		
Consonance	Hi	1 Before		1.34	1.36	-.12	-.05
	Lo	3 After		1.46	1.31		
Identification	Hi	1 Before		2.21	1.88	.17	.08
	Lo	4 After		2.04	1.96		
Closeness to religious Jews in Israel*	Hi	1 Before		3.72	3.56	.08	-.56
	Lo	5 After		3.64	4.12		

* Closeness to religious Jews in Israel has been chosen to represent closeness because of its higher reliability and greater relevance.

None of the differences between means cited are significant, but cumulatively they seem to suggest an effect engendered by interviewing.

If we wish to gain a fuller understanding of the changes in the eleventh grade we might consider the possibility of an interaction between interviewing and initial status of self attitudes. Glancing back at the comparison among classes in the eleventh grade (Table 7) we note that the third class is the most favorable toward nine Jewish variables to begin with. At the end it is again the most favorable, and its gain, an average of .05 for the nine variables has been the largest. As against this, the first class begins lowest and ends up lowest on Jewish subidentity with an average loss of -.11. The mean change for the class in which no interviews were conducted is intermediate (.03). It would seem that the interview effect for which we have noted some support is best considered jointly with initial status. What interviewing may very well do is to produce congruent attitude change, depressing what is already low and raising what is high. This interpretation is in line with contrast-assimilation phenomena discussed in change-of-attitude theory (Sherif, Sherif, and Nebergall, 1965, Chap. 5).

Social Relations

Social relations are thought to mediate influences. Specifically, it may be hypothesized that quite apart from directional changes in attitudes the raising of issues into salience should result in greater pupil agreement as a result of increased communication (Festinger and Thibaut, 1952). Table 9 presents mean standard deviations on eight variables. The first column shows such means on the pre-test; the second column, on the post-test; and the third column indicates change. The procedure of averaging standard deviations appears justified in view of the similar magnitude of most constituents. Standard deviations are here treated as indices of agreement. In 10 out of 13 classes the mean of standard deviations decreases which means that pupil agreement on the constituent issues increases between test administrations.

The explanation that comes to mind is that norms begin to form when the present issues, that are otherwise rarely discussed from what pupils tell us, become more salient. The formation of norms results in smaller standard deviations (Sherif, 1936). We also tested the hypothesis that there would be a greater convergence on norms in the more cohesive classes by utilizing results from our sociometric questionnaire to operationalize cohesiveness. Results were inconclusive. 7)

It appears then that regardless of the direction in which attitudes change the mere presentation of questions sets into motion forces that result in greater agreement. Again, there is in this evidence for an effect of research activity.

TABLE 9

INTER-PUPIL AGREEMENT

Class	Mean Standard Deviation over eight variables [1]		
	Before	After	Net change[2]
8 I	.93	.84	-.09
8 III	.92	.90	-.02
9 I	.87	.82	-.05
9 II	.89	.92	.03
9 III	.94	.88	-.06
9 IV	1.00	.89	-.11
10 I	.90	.85	-.05
10 II	.88	.79	-.09
10 III	.95	.92	-.03
10 IV	.96	.84	-.12
11 I	.92	.94	.02
11 II	.95	.89	-.06
11 III	.83	.84	.01

1. Mean of standard deviations on 10 questions representing eight variables (self-definition, centrality, valence, consonance, identification, interdependence, normative dependence, closeness)

2. A negative (downward) change in the magnitude of standard deviation indicates an increase in inter-pupil agreement.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The present report has dealt with an exploration of Jewish-Israeli identity in one Israeli secondary school and the influences perceived by pupils and teachers to be operating upon it. Ethnic identity was conceptualized as attitudes and values relevant to the Jewish and Israeli subregions of identity. The study includes talks with teachers, interviews with pupils, two administrations of a survey questionnaire and of a sociometric instrument.

We tried to become acquainted with some of the influences and values thought to be operating in the school we called Hillside High. Hence, a large part of the report related to the thoughts and opinions of teachers and pupils. It hopefully conveys something of the school's value climate. We also surveyed attitudes toward several aspects of Jewishness and Israeliness roughly divided into self and cognitive variables. A number of conclusions are presented forthwith and some implications indicated:

1. The principal, teachers, and pupils of the school are heavily oriented - sometimes against their better judgment - toward the intellectual goals of a secondary school. The school pays some attention to the nurture of a liberal or humanistic ideology and a mildly traditional outlook on the Jewish heritage.

2. On matters of ethnic identity there appears to be a close correspondence between the views of teachers and pupils. Jewishness is

interpreted by most as a feeling, awareness, consciousness, or identification; by a minority, as an area of knowledge and intellectual commitment as well. Whether this general agreement among pupils and teachers reflects influences of the latter on the former or some common etiology is difficult to know.

3. There is a strong desire on the part of many teachers to strengthen the affective associations of Jewishness and some readiness on the part of pupils to receive the necessary experiences. There is little clarity on how this should be done.

4. Among influences within the school the individual teacher, the manner in which he presents his material, and the reading he assigns appear most conspicuous. History is the most effective subject.

5. Among outside influences the home is given the greatest credit by both teachers and pupils, though pupils often have difficulty in reconstructing the precise nature of this influence. The secular youth movements to which pupils belong do not play an important role with respect to Jewish values.

6. The Israeli subidentity is stronger than the Jewish one especially when the two are directly compared. There is some moderating effect on the difference in strength between them in that the two subidentities are highly consonant and that a large part of what was once essentially Jewish has been absorbed into the Israeli ideology.

7. With increasing age there appears to be a decline in some of the elements that are held to characterize the Jewish and Israeli subidentities. In particular, pupils tend to think of themselves less as Jews and Israelis and more as private persons. The decline is more noticeable in the elements of Jewish subidentity. Two explanations are offered, adolescent value changes and curricular content.

8. Research activity, mainly interviewing, seems to have an effect on attitudes. This effect is probably achieved by the greater salience of ethnic issues and the increase in communication resulting from it. Research activity seems to interact with the initial status of attitudes.

9. Regardless of the direction of attitude change agreement among pupils increases on almost all questions between the first and second administration of the questionnaire.

A basis for the strengthening of the Jewish subregion of pupil identity and for the maintaining of Israeliness seems to exist in the Hillside secondary school. The approach to this end suggested by the findings of this study is a modification of the value climate. Jewish identity can be made more salient and reinforced by curricular content adapted to the intellectual development of pupils. Since academic achievement is the dominant part of the present value climate it is probably easier to strengthen a knowledge of Judaism than a feeling for it.

In future studies one might supplement the study of value climate and their effects on identity by a closer scrutiny of the way cognitive, affective, and action tendencies components interact within the individual pupil. When pupils define Judaism in one way or another, what implications does this have for the way they feel about it and act toward it? When pupils bring certain feelings and associations from home, does this affect their readiness to receive certain types of cognitions? What combination of experiences are suitable to value education at different ages and with what types of prior experience? It might be helpful to construct a typology of ethnic identity and then relate identity types to modes of classroom presentation.

Clearly, the school setting offers many possibilities for the study of attitudes, values, motives, and influences associated with ethnic identity.

APPENDIX A

Attitude Questionnaire for Pupils

You are participating in a scientific study conducted in a number of secondary schools in Israel. It is the purpose of this study to clarify the opinions of Israeli youth on a number of topics. This questionnaire will also be given in other classes of your school. It does not test your knowledge or understanding, but only samples your opinions and feelings. It is not a test and there are no "wright" or "wrong" answers.

The questionnaires will be kept in complete confidence and no one but members of the research staff will see your replies. No details of your answers will be turned over to the Ministry of Education, to the school administration, or to teachers. At the end of the study results of the opinion survey of Israeli high school youth will be published, but without mention of names.

You are requested to reply to the questions in the order of their appearance. Do not return to pages that you have already filled or which you have not yet reached. Please, read every question and do not skip any!

On most questions alternative responses are provided. Circle the number of the response nearest to your own opinion or feeling. If none of the given responses corresponds exactly to your opinion, choose the response closest to it.

Example: "Do you feel it is good to go frequently to the movies"?

1. Very good.
2. Good.
3. Not so good.
4. Certainly not good.

On a small number of questions we left an empty space so that you may reply in your own words. If you do not understand some word or question please raise your hand and one of the investigators will explain to you.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1 - 8 Everyone thinks about himself from time to time, and asks himself "Who am I?" "A person?" - yes; "A pupil?" - of course; but what else? We are asking you to try and think and reply to the question "Who am I?"

1. ________________
2. ________________
3. ________________

....

....

....

8. ________________

9. Mark on the scale below if you feel more Israeli or more Jewish. The scale has seven steps, at one end of which appears the word "Jewish" and at the other end the word "Israeli."

Indicate your position on this scale by placing an X in the appropriate space. To the extent that the mark is nearer to "Israeli" it means that you feel yourself so much more Israeli than Jewish, and the nearer your mark is to "Jewish" it means that you feel yourself so much more Jewish than Israeli. (Place your X between the lines and not on the lines.)

Israeli ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Jewish

10. Mark on the scale below if you feel more Jewish than a Private Person or more a Private Person than Jewish.

Jewish ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Private Person

11. Mark on the scale below if you feel yourself more Israeli than a Private Person or more a Private Person than Israeli.

Israeli ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Private Person

12. Does being Jewish play an important part in your life?

    1. It plays a very important part.
    2. It plays an important part.
    3. It is of little importance.
    4. It plays no part.

13. Does being an Israeli play an important part in your life.

    As in 12.

14. Do you think Jews are similar to one another in culture and customs?

    1. Very similar.
    2. Similar.
    3. Only slightly similar.
    4. Not at all similar.

15. Do you think Jews are similar in their characteristics and behavior?

    As in 14.

16. Do you think Israelis are similar in culture and customs?

    As in 14.

17. Do you think Israelis are similar in characteristics and behavior?

    As in 14.

18. Do you think Israelis are similar to Jews abroad in culture and customs?

    As in 14.

19. Do you think Israelis are similar to Jews abroad in characteristics and behavior?

    As in 14.

20. If you were to be born all over again, would you wish to be born a Jew?
    1. Yes, I would wish to be born a Jew.
    2. It would not matter.
    3. No, I would not wish to be born a Jew.

21. If you were to live your life over again in a foreign country, would you wish to be born a Jew?

    As in 20.

22. If you were to be born all over again, would you wish to be born an Israeli?
    1. Yes, I would wish to be born an Israeli.
    2. It would not matter.
    3. No, I would not wish to be born an Israeli.

23. When I feel more Israeli:
    1. I also feel more Jewish.
    2. There is no relation between my feeling Israeli and Jewish.
    3. I feel less Jewish.

24. When I feel more Jewish:
    1. I also feel more Israeli.
    2. There is no relation, etc.
    3. I feel less Israeli.

25. What do you think is the main reason for the rise of antisemitism?
    1. The characteristics of non-Jews.
    2. The situation of the Jews as a minority abroad.
    3. The characteristics of Jews abroad.

26. Would you be willing to make friends with newcomers?
    1. Yes, definitely.
    2. Yes.
    3. Yes, but prefer to have native-born friends.
    4. No.
    5. Certainly not.

27. Would you be willing to make friends with Arabs?
    1. Yes, definitely.
    2. Yes.
    3. Yes, but prefer to have Jewish friends.
    4. No.
    5. Certainly not.

28. When an important foreign newspaper offends the Jewish people, do you feel as if it was insulting you?
    1. Never.
    2. Seldom.
    3. Often.
    4. Always.

29. When an important foreign newspaper offends Jews abroad, do you feel as if it was offending you?

    As in 28.

30. When an important foreign newspaper offends Israel, do you feel as if it was offending you?

    As in 28.

31. What do you think is the main reason for the hostility of Arab countries toward Israel? Mention one reason only.
    1. The attitude of Arab countries.
    2. Israel's position as a Jewish country surrounded by Arab countries.
    3. The attitude of Israel.

32. When the prestige of part of the Jews in the world is lowered, does this hurt other Jews?
    1. Almost never.
    2. Seldom.
    3. Often.
    4. Almost always.

33. When the prestige of some Israelis in the world is lowered, does this hurt other Israelis?

    As in 32.

34. When the status of Jews in the world is lowered, does this hurt the State of Israel?

    As in 32.

35. When the status of the State of Israel is lowered, does this hurt the status of Jews throughout the world?

    As in 32.

36. Is it the duty of the State of Israel to help Jews in other countries in time of need?
    1. Yes, under all circumstances.
    2. Yes, but only if the help does not result in a serious detriment to the State of Israel.
    3. Yes, but only if the help does not result in a detriment at all to the State of Israel.
    4. No.

37. Is it the duty of Jews in other countries to help the State of Israel in time of need?
    1. Yes, under all circumstances.
    2. Yes, but only if the help does not result in a serious detriment to the Jews themselves.
    3. Yes, but only if the help does not result in any detriment at all to the Jews in other countries.

38-43 Below is a list of different categories of Jews. How close do you feel to each of them?

38. Religious Jews abroad.
39. Non-religious Jews abroad.
40. Religious Jews in Israel.
41. Non-religious Jews in Israel.
42. Jews abroad who support Israel.
43. Jews abroad who do not support Israel.

On each question:

1. Extremely close.
2. Very close.
3. Close.
4. Not so close.
5. Not at all close.

44-45 If an Israeli Jew meets you abroad and by mistake takes you for a non-Jewish non-Israeli, will you correct his impression and explain to him that you are:

44. Jewish.

    1. Yes.
    2. I am not sure, but I think so.
    3. I don't know.
    4. I am not sure, but I think not.
    5. No

45. Israeli

    As in 44.

46-47 If a foreign Jew meets you abroad and by mistake takes you for a non-Jewish non-Israeli will you correct his impression and explain to him that you are:

As in 44-45.

48-49 If a non-Jew meets you abroad and by mistake takes you for a non-Jewish non-Israeli, will you correct him and explain to him that you are:

As in 44-45 and 46-47.

50. When an important foreign newspaper offends Israelis (Jews), do you feel as if it was offending you?

    1. Never.
    2. Seldom.
    3. Often.
    4. Always.

51. When an important foreign newspaper offends Israeli non-Jews, do you feel as if it was offending you?

    As in 50.

52. Are you

    1. Very religious.
    2. Religious.
    3. Traditionalist.
    4. Non-religious.
    5. Anti-religious.

53. Are your parents

    1. Very religious.
    2. Religious.
    3. Traditionalist.
    4. Not religious.
    5. Anti-religious.

54-71 Other autobiographic information.

Note: Only a part of the information gathered was utilized in the present report.

APPENDIX B

Attitude Questionnaire for Pupils – (Post Test)

This questionnaire forms part of a scientific study conducted by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Its purpose is to clarify some of the opinions of Israeli youth on certain topics. You already replied to some of the questions, but we ask you to answer a second time for research purposes. Please, read the questions carefully, and do not skip any! This questionnaire does not examine your knowledge or understanding, but only your opinions and feelings. This is not a test and there are no "correct" or "incorrect" replies.

On most questions you will choose one of several possible replies. Place a circle around the number of the question that best expresses your opinion and feelings. If none of the questions fits your opinion, choose the answer closest to it. On a small number of questions we left an empty space so that you may reply in your own words.

If you do not understand some word or question please raise your hand, and one of the proctors will explain to you.

Thank you very much for your cooperation

The post questionnaire contained the following questions of the questionnaire reported in Appendix A:

9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 21, 23, 29, 32, 33, 36, 38, 39, 40.

There were three questions that had not appeared before:

What, in your opinion, are Jews?

1. Mainly a religious grouping
2. Mainly a people
3. Both a religious group and a people
4. Something else, what?

Every Jew should feel as if he were a survivor of the Holocaust

1. Yes
2. No

I feel as if I were a survivor of the Holocaust

1. Yes
2. No

APPENDIX C

Pupil Interview

Part I

1. Does the question "Who am I?" occupy you?
2. When you ask yourself "Who am I?" does it occur to you to ask whether you are a) a Jew, b) an Israeli?
3. Are there occasions when you are particularly aware of being a) Jewish, b) Israeli ? When ?
4. What do you mean by the word "Jewish?"
5. What are the Jews in your opinion? (A religious group, etc.)
6. Complete the sentence:

   a) We are Jews, and they are ____________.

   b) We are Israelis, and they are __________.
7. Place yourself on the following scales (X in the appropriate space)

   a) Having strong Jewish sentiment __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Having no Jewish sentiment

   b) Having strong Israeli sentiment __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Having no Israeli sentiment

   Explain your choices.
8. In the questionnaire you replied that you feel more (less) Jewish when you feel more Israeli. Try and give examples.
9. Are there also occasions when the opposite of (8) is true?
10. Try to place your feelings on the following scales; if on any particular scale you feel neither Israeli nor Jewish place a circle about the x next to the scale.

    a. Israeli __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Jewish x Neither
    When I think of myself

    b. Israeli __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Jewish x Neither
    When I am at home

    c. Israeli __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Jewish x Neither
    When I am in school

d. Israeli __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Jewish x Neither
When I study history

e. Israeli __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Jewish x Neither
When I study J. Lit.

f. Israeli __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Jewish x Neither
When I study Bible

g. Israeli __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Jewish x Neither
When I am at party

h. Israeli __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Jewish x Neither

When I meet a for. J.

i. Israeli __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Jewish x Neither

When I meet newcomer

j. Israeli __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Jewish x Neither
When I meet Druze

k. Israeli __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Jewish x Neither
When I think of draft

l. Israeli __:__:__:__:__:__:__ Jewish x Neither
When I visit synagogue

11. a. Does your being Jewish influence your life greatly? How?
    b. Does your being Israeli influence your life greatly? How?
    c. What is more important to you in life, the fact that you are Jewish or Israeli? Why?

12. Why did you indicate that you were mere ready to be born a Jew in Israel or abroad in the questionnaire?

13. Are you proud of being a Jew? Why? Of being an Israeli?

14. a. What in your opinion unites Jews?
    b. What in your opinion separates Jews?

15. In what respect are Jews similar to one another?

16. In what respect are Jews different from one another?

17. In what respect are Jews different from others?

18. Does your evaluation of different Jewish communities in the world differ? For example .... Why?

19. Specifically, how different is your evaluation of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union from that of the United States?

20. a) Why do you feel that Jews in other countries should (need not) help Israel in time of need?

    b) Why do you feel that Israel should (need not) help Jews in other countries?

21. Why should foreign Jews help Israel more than Israel should help them, or the opposite?

22. Who needs the help more, Israel or foreign Jews?

23. a) What kind of help do you think foreign Jews should render to Israel?

    b) What kind of help do you think Israel should render to foreign Jews?

24. a) When the prestige of some Jews is lowered, does this hurt other Jews?

    b) When the prestige of some Jews rises does this help other Jews?

    c) (If there is a difference in replies to a) and b): How large is the difference? Why did you answer differently on a) and b)?

25. According to what do you define "Jew" (Religion of parents, person's religion, person's feeling) what is essential for someone to be a Jew, and what is desirable?

26. What do you understand the meaning of a "good Jew" to be?

27. Is there in your opinion a difference between being a good Jew in Israel and abroad?

28. From whom do you take an example as to what a good Jew should do? (Parents, friends, religious Jews, etc.)

29. Who is a good Jew in your opinion? (Does this have to do with personal behavior or belongingness, etc.?)

30. Why do you (do you not) feel closeness to
    a) Religious Jews abroad?
    b) Non-religious Jews abroad?
    c) Religious Jews in Israel?
    d) Non-religious Jews in Israel?
    e) Newcomers?

31. Do you have any personal acquaintance with any of the foregoing types? What impression did they make on you?

32. Why do you think that Jewish communities abroad will (will not) maintain their Jewish character?

33. Why do you think that the State of Israel will (will not) maintain its Jewish character?

34. Do you feel that something should be done for the maintenance of Jewishness?

a) In foreign Jewish communities? .Why? How?

b) In the State of Israel? Why? How?

35. a) On what does the fate of the Jewish people depend?

b) On what does the fate of the State of Israel depend?

36. What do you think is the reason for antisemitism abroad?

37. To what extent do you think contributes the behavior of Jews to antisemitism?

38. Do you think that antisemitism abroad can be overcome? How?

39. Do you think of yourself as a Zionist? What does that mean to you?

40. How do you define Zionism?

41. Do you consider the continuance of the Zionist movement important?

42. What makes you (does not make you) proud in each of the following historical periods?

a) Second Temple b) Spain c) The Townlet d) the Mellah
e) Enlightenment f) Holocaust g) Resettlement

43. Do you prefer to read about Jewish or General history? Why?

44. Do you prefer to learn about Jewish or General history? Why?

45. What do you think of the way Jewish history is taught in school?

Part II (may be given at a different scheduling) Influences.

School

51. What other lessons in school deal with Jewish matters?

Do you like these?

52. Do you think that these lessons influenced you in Jewish matters?

53. In what respects did school influence you on Jewish matters?
a) Pride b) Attitude toward fate of diaspora Jews
c) Toward Jewish history d) National, traditional,
religious ideology e) Action tendency in Jewish matters.
Indicate direction and strength in each of these respects.

54. What in school influenced you the most? (i.e. general atmosphere, customs, parties, organized school activities, clubs, friends, subject matter, teaching method, talks with teachers, class discussions, and so forth)

55. Try to describe the Jewish atmosphere in school (customs, parties, teacher and pupil opinion). Are you satisfied with it?

56. Do you think that the school makes any deliberate effort to influence pupils in Jewish matters? Does it succeed? With you?

57. Are there teachers in the school who have a particular influence on pupils? Who? What do these teachers teach? How does their influence express itself?

58. Are there also teachers who have a particular influence on matters Jewish? To what extent do they succeed?

59. Do you have any class discussions on Jewish topics? What opinions are expressed?

60. Do pupils talk amongst themselves sometimes on Jewish topics? On what occasions? What opinions do pupils express?

61. What in general are pupils' opinions on Jewish matters?

62. Are there any pupils in your class who have special influence? In what matters?

63. Are there pupils in your class who try to influence the others in Jewish matters?

64. Do you ever try to influence your class mates? In Jewish matters, too?

65. Does your school organize activities connected with Jewish topics?

66. Are your friends generally among your school mates?

Youth Movement

67. Are you a member of a youth movement? Why? Why that one?

68. Are you active in your movement?

69. What position does your movement take in Jewish matters?

70. Are Jewish topics raised at movement discussions?

71. Do you discuss Jewish topics among movement members outside of scheduled meetings?

72. Do you think that the movement influenced your opinions and feelings in Jewish matters?

73. What in the movement influenced you most? (Official position, slogans, talks, projects, leader, friends)

Home

74. Did your parents try to influence you in Jewish matters in a direction different from that of movement, school, or friends?

75. What in general was your parents' influence on your opinions and feelings in Jewish matters?

76. What mainly influenced you at home? The general atmosphere, customs, parents' behavior, parents' opinion, deliberate training, relatives, neighbors)

77. Try to describe the atmosphere and Jewish customs in your home.

78. Do you discuss Jewish topics in your home?

79. What are your parents' views on Jewish matters? Do you agree with them?

80. Did your parents make an attempt to guide you into a particular direction with respect to Jewishness?

81. Did any changes take place during the years?
    a) With respect to atmosphere, Jewish customs, opinions, and Jewish behavior of parents and their manner of educating in these
    b) With respect to the influence of your home?
82. Were your siblings (if any) influenced the way you were?
83. Did your siblings influence you or did you influence them?
84. Are there any relatives, neighbors, acquaintances who frequent your home and influence you in Jewish matters?
85. Do you recall any Jewish events related to your home or any others that influenced you?
86. Try to summarize the major influences among those we have mentioned (School, youth movement, home) and others (friends, books, radio, newspapers, etc.) that to your mind formed the opinions and feelings in Jewish matters that you have today. Try to rank-order them as to which influenced you more and which less. If you can, try to specify which one among all those had the major impact.

Interviewers' comments: ....

Note: The many probes associated with questions and the space provided for the recording of verbatim replies have been left out in this translation. The original interview schedule contains 23 pages.

APPENDIX D

Social Relations Scale

We are asking you to answer sincerely the questions that appear below and promise in our turn that your replies will be kept in confidence and not be communicated to anyone other than the research staff.

1. Are you generally satisfied with the social life in your class? (Circle the most appropriate answer)

   a. Very satisfied
   b. Satisfied
   c. I don't know
   d. Not so satisfied
   e. Not at all satisfied

If you have any comments, please add:

2. In every class there are a few pupils who influence matters in in the class. Please list the names of pupils who influence things in your class:

1. ____________	5. __________
2. ____________	6. __________
3. ____________	7. __________
4. ____________	8. __________

3. List the names of boys and girls whom you consider your good friends:

a. In your class:	b. In school outside of your class:
______________	______________
______________	______________

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX E

Salience

How aware are pupils of their Israeli and Jewish subidentity? This is a question of salience. Answers could be elicited to some such direct question, but there is a strong possibility that asking pupils how aware they are of being Israeli or Jewish would suggest answers that go beyond salience toward evaluation.

We sought a way of measuring salience without putting words into the mouth of respondents. We also felt that the question should come before anyone realized what we were studying. Thus, it had to be open-ended and unexpected. The very first item on the Hillside High questionnaire went this way:

> Everyone thinks of himself now and then and asks himself: Who am I? A person? Yes, of course. A pupil? Surely. But what else? Try and think of answers to the question "Who am I?"

Eight numbered spaces were provided arranged in a column a page long. Replies could therefore be considered as placed in some order of saliency.

The 482 pupils from the eighth to the 12th grade made 451 replies in the first space, a first choice, and 31 omitted the "Who am I?" question altogether. 414 pupils used the second space as well; 336, 223, 136, 74, 39, and 21, the third to eighth spaces, respectively. The first three replies can be considered critical since they provide an opportunity for the mention of an Israeli, a Jewish, and any further subidentity. All we wanted to know whether someone thought of himself immediately as Israeli, Jewish, or anything else. Subjects declared themselves such things as

"Israeli," "Jew," "Citizen of Israel," "Boy Scout," "Oldest Son," and so forth.

Mentions were categorized as predominantly 1) Israeli subidentity, 2) Jewish subidentity, 3) Both of these, 4) Other (neutral). Table 10 shows percentage distributions of mentions over all eight choices, by grade.

TABLE 10

WHO AM I ?

Eight Choices
(451 Pupils)

	Percent of All Mentions					
Grade	Israeli Subidentity	Jewish	Is.–Jew.	Other	Total %	Mentions N
Eighth	17	12	1	70	100	389
Ninth	17	12	1	70	100	478
Tenth	22	14	2	62	100	454
Eleventh	22	12	0	66	100	241
Twelfth	17	7	1	75	100	132
All Grades	18	13	2	67	100	1,694

It will be noted that two thirds of all mentions made no reference to Israeli or Jewish ethnicity. Since this is true for mentions over all eight choices we must inquire into the possibility that Israeli-Jewish content is unevenly distributed over the choices. Further analysis of data shows that on the first choice neutral mentions take up 69% of replies, and that on the second to eighth choices they take up 59%, 69%, 74%, 73%, 69%, 77%, and again 77%. The salience of Israeli-Jewish ethnicity is highest on the second choice and tapers off thereafter.

This leaves one third of mentions to the Israeli and Jewish subidentities. One notes that the overall ratio between Israeli and Jewish content is 18% : 13%, that is 1.4 : 1. This ratio is maintained approximately on the several choices. The ratio of neutral to Israeli to Jewish choices thus becomes 5.0 : 1.4 : 1.0.

A question of interest is the presence or absence of an age trend over grades. Percentages in Table 10 do not indicate any such trend. The only grade that appears to differ from the others is the 12th. Here, Jewish content is particularly rare, neutral content relatively frequent. This is in keeping with other findings of a weakened Jewish identity in that grade.

What if one concentrates on the first three choices already considered critical? Will a trend emerge from percentage distributions of those choices? Table 11 indicates that this is the case. Again, neutral (with respect to Israeli-Jewish ethnicity) mentions make up two thirds of the total and the ratio of Israeli to Jewish content is about 20% : 13%, or 1.5 : 1. But now we may discern an age trend as well. The salience of the Israeli subidentity increases through the grades while the Jewish one declines, though less definitely. Non-ethnic mentions remain stable. Here the 12th grade looks like an end point of high school development rather than like a special case.

TABLE 11

WHO AM I?
FIRST THREE CHOICES
451 Pupils

	Percent of All Mentions					
Grade	Israeli	Jewish	Is.-Jew. Subidentity	Other	Total %	Mentions N
Eighth	18	15	0	67	100	223
Ninth	14	14	1	70	99	348
Tenth	23	15	2	61	101	340
Eleventh	23	12	0	65	100	191
Twelfth	31	4	1	64	100	99
All Grades	20	13	1	65	99	1,201

Summing up our findings we may state that the salience of the Israeli subidentity is about 50% greater than its Jewish counterpart and that both occupy 1/3 of the region tapped by the "Who am I?" question. Moreover, there is some indication of a growth with age in the Israeli subregion as compared to a decline in the Jewish subregion of identity, at least within Hillside High.

SELECTED READINGS

Adar, L. and C. Adler. Education for Values in Schools for New Immigrant Children. Jerusalem: School of Education, 1965.

Coleman, J. S. The Adolescent Society. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1961.

Connor, D. V. "Behavior in Class Groups of Contrasting Climates". The British Journal of Educational Psychology XXX (1960), 244-49.

Festinger, L., and J. W. Thibaut. "Interpersonal Communication in Small Groups", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVI (1951), 92-99.

Goodman, L. A. and W. H. Kruksal, "Measures of Association for Cross Classification", Journal of American Statistical Association, XLIX (1954).

Gordon, C. W. The Social System of the High School. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957.

Herman, S. N. "American Jewish Students in Israel", Jewish Social Studies, XXIV (1962), 3-29.

Herman, S. N. and E. Schild. "Ethnic Role Conflict in a Cross-Cultural Situation", Human Relations, XIII (1960), 215-28.

Hollingshead, A. B. Elmtown's Youth. New York: Wiley, 1949.

Horrocks, J. E. The Psychology of Adolescence. 2nd Ed. Boston: Brighton, Mifflin, 1962.

Klineberger, A. G. "The Right to Educate toward Material Values", Megamot, XI (1962), 332-37.

Lehmann, I. J., B. K. Sinha, and R. T. Hartnett. "Changes in Attitudes and Values Associated with College Attendance", Journal of Educational Psychology, LVII (1966), 89-98.

Mead, M. The School in American Culture. Cambridge, Mass.: The Harvard University Press, 1951.

Miller, D. "The Study of Social Relationships: Situation, Identity and Social Interaction", S. Koch, ed. in Psychology: A Study of Science, N. Y.: Mcgraw Hill, 1963, vol. 5, 638-737.

Newcomb, T. M. *Personality and Social Change*. New York: Dryden Press, 1943.

Newcomb, T. M. *The Acquaintance Process*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.

Remmers, H. H. and D. H. Redler. *The American Teenager*. Indianapolis: Bobe Merrill, 1957.

N. Rothenstreich. "On Teaching for Education", *Chinuch*, XXXV (1961), 97-102.

Schild, E. O. "The Foreign Student, as Stranger, Learning the Norms of the Host Culture", *Journal of Social Issues*, XVIII (1962), 41-54.

Sherif, M. *The Psychology of Social Norms*. New York: Harper, 1936.

Sherif, M. "Social Psychology: Problems and Trends in Interdisciplinary Relationships", in S. Koch, ed., *Psychology: A Study of a Science*, New York: Mcgraw Hill, 1963, vol. 6.

Sherif, C. W., Sherif, M. and R. E. Nebergall, *Attitude and Attitude Change.* Philadelphia: Saunders, 1965.

Simon, E., "Educational Objectives in Israel", in *Theory and Practice in Secondary Education*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Secondary School, 1962.

Spindler, G. D. "Education in a Transforming American Culture". *Harvard Educational Review*, XXV (1955), 145-56.

Warner, W. L. R. J. Havighurst, and M. B. Loeb. *Who shall be Educated*? New York: Harper, 1944.

White, R. K. and R. Lippitt. *Autocarcy and Democracy: And Experimental Inquiry.* New York: Harper, 1960.

Withall, J. and W. W. Lewis. "Social Interaction in the Classroom", in N. J. Gage, ed., *Handbook of Reading in Teaching*, Chicago, Ill.: Rand McNally, 1963.

Notes

1) For papers anticipating some of the present formulations, see Herman and Schild (1960), Herman (1962), Schild (1962).

2) The Ministry of Education, in cooperation with the Ministry of Defense and the Israeli Defence Army, maintains a program of pre-military training in the upper grades of secondary schools.

3) Over 80% of pupils are organized in youth movements. These are voluntary organizations having various degrees of affiliation with political movements or the international Scout movement. They promote service to the nation, moderation, interest in the outdoors, and scouting activities, among others. Most of the organized pupils in Hillside belong to Scout troops. Although youth movements take up a few hours during the week the school administration encourages them as a partner in education.

4) States one British investigator: "The important basic elements in any particular classroom climate are the home and school settings and the personalities of the participants as individuals. However, it is the unique conditions which are generated in the teacher-pupil interactions that constitute the classroom climate proper." D. V. Conner, "Behavior in Class Groups of Contrasting Climates," The British Journal of Educational Psychology, XXX (1960), 244-49.

5) A traditional piece of headgear worn by some pious Jews.

6) Gamma is a distribution-free statistic suitable when the more stringent assumptions of the Pearson coefficient of correlation cannot be properly maintained. See L. A. Goodman and W. H. Kruksal "Measures of Association for Cross Classification", Journal of American Statistical Association XLIV (1954).

7) Different indices of cohesiveness derived from the sociometric questionnaire were inconsistent and none covaried appreciably with pupil agreement as operationalized by the mean of standard deviations reported above.

CHAPTER IV

ETHNIC IDENTITY AND RELATIONS AMONG ETHNIC GROUPS IN ISRAEL

Yochanan Peres
Department of Sociology
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Table of Contents

I Introduction Page 155

II Procedure

- a. Data collection 161
- b. Data processing 164

III Findings

- a. Inter-ethnic social distance 165
    - 1. Description of instruments 165
    - 2. Comparison among groups 172
    - 3. Scale interrelations 176
- b. Evaluation of ethnic groups 180
    - 1. Perceived evaluation 180
    - 2. Measurement of evaluation by the semantic differential 182
    - 3. Interrelations among evaluations 189
- c. Preferred patterns of group integration 191
    - 1. The desire to integrate 191
    - 2. Ways of integration 193
- d. Actual patterns of integration 196
    - 1. Feeling of acceptance 196
    - 2. Social mobility 197
- e. Ethnic identification 198
    - 1. Centrality 200
    - 2. Solidarity 202
    - 3. Valence 204
    - 4. Interrelations among components of identification 206
    - 5. Narrow and broad ethnic identification 207

Page

f. Relations among variables 209

1. Length of stay 210
2. Feeling of acceptance 211
3. Perceived evaluation 211
4. Mobility 212
5. Intermarriage 213
6. Religious observance 214
7. Ethnic identification and social distance 216
8. Ethnic identification and the desire for group action 217
9. Social distance and the desirability of group differences 217

IV Conclusion 218

I. INTRODUCTION

It is the purpose of the present study to investigate the relation between ethnic identity and inter-ethnic group relations in Israel. The relevance of identity to the analysis of ethnic group relations has been acknowledged by a number of investigators (Erikson, G. Allport, Myrdal), but in spite of the popularity enjoyed by such constructs as identity and identification there have been few attempts to translate them into operational terms.

Erikson 1) for example used the construct identity intuitively without presenting any clear definition or establishing precise relations to such other sociological and psychological terms as personality, internalized values, role, identification, and the like. To some extent Miller 2) filled the gap by his systematic discussion which will serve as our starting point. Miller regards identity as a system of opinions and attitudes about the self. 3) The identity has unity and continuity and integrates the many roles filled by the individual throughout his life.

Miller structures identity into three regions, the core, the subidentities, and the public identity. The core is the organizing principle of the identity, is formed earliest, closest to the center of the personality, and therefore most difficult to change. The subidentities are individual representations of the many roles which the individual is called upon to play, i.e. Yemenite Jew, Israeli Arab. The public identity refers to the way an individual presents himself, by his behavior, to others. 4)

The "public identity" is opposed to the "private or self identity" which has to do with the way the person appears to himself.

Erikson maintains that identity is the outcome of the gradual integration of multiple identifications. We are not sure if Miller's analysis of identity as briefly presented above corresponds to such a view, but clearly identifications are somehow a part of identity. Accordingly, identification with a certain ethnic group forms part of a person's ethnic identity. The social-psychological literature is not in complete agreement on the meaning of group identifications, but they tend to be regarded as strong, positive orientations toward the group, that is, as more than mere membership. Apparently, what investigators call identification is factorially complex. We propose to name and analyze what seem to be some of the major components of group identification:

a. Centrality. One of the basic facts of modern life is the multiplicity of roles and groups with which we are associated. 5) This quite naturally raises the question as to how the several roles and group affiliation are organized within any one personality. 6) Among the theorists who tried to cope with this question we may mention Merton ("multiple roles") and Goffman (the "presented self.") 7) Each in his own manner attempts to conceptualize the way in which the normal personality reconciles manifold and often conflicting simultaneous obligations. In our own work we apply K. Lewin's life-space model. 8)

Lewin thought of centrality as the extent to which a region is tied up with other regions in life-space. A similar position is taken by Newcomb, Turner and Converse[7] who think of the centrality of an attitudinal object as the frequency with which it appears in consciousness. There is of course no more central object than the self.

Newcomb et al. effectively differentiate between centrality and salience. While the latter refers to the momentary interest aroused by an object in a given situation, centrality refers to a "durable and generalized salience" over a wide sample of situations.

In the analysis of identity we are interested in the centrality of subidentities, in particular, and not of just any object, in general. One may speak of the relative centrality of the ethnic subidentity among other subidentities. For some people the ethnic subidentity is little more than a demographic fact; for others, it is a vital key to many facets of their lives. A full assessment of the relative centrality of someone's ethnic subidentity would call for extensive observation and interviewing. In the present paper we have confined ourselves to aspects of centrality perceived by respondents themselves.

b. Solidarity. A second component of a person's group identification in his solidarity with the group. Intuitively, solidarity refers to the extent with which someone affectively shares in the fate of another. One is solidary with a group if he thinks of its achievements and failures as his own. The notion of solidarity bears resemblance to Lewin's "dependence." Thus, *A* is positively dependent on *B* when the attainment of *B*'s goals implies attainment of *A*'s goals as well. 8) It should be noted, however, that Lewin's dependence need not go beyond a functional relation such as may be found among people having a common interest, while solidarity is first of all a feeling for others, a state of mind. Solidarity is not always based on common interests, nor do common interests (interdependence) necessarily lead to solidarity.

c. Valence. A third component of ethnic identification is valence, or the attraction the group has for the individual, his willingness to belong to it. Valence is close to what Merton and Hyman 9) call "normative reference group." Merton defines this construct as the group whose norms the individual accepts while we talk about the willingness (desire) to belong. Yet, the examples he gives always seem to include motives of affiliation. Indeed, in voluntary groups the desire to belong may not differentiate because individuals without such a desire are not likely to stay in the group; but the more difficult it becomes to leave a group the greater is the probability that it will contain individuals who are not interested in group membership. Prisons are an example in point: almost without a doubt imprisonment is a very central fact of life to the imprisoned and there may very well be solidarity among those sharing this fate, but there are surely not many who wish to belong. Valence is low even where the prisoner accepts group norms.

3. Are social distances in Israel symmetrical? Is the distance from European Jews to Oriental ones the same as the distance from Oriental Jews to European ones?
4. How are social distances interrelated? Does someone reticent about social ties with members of a specific group show similar reticence toward members of other such groups?

b. Evaluation of different ethnic groups. One of the most important indicators of the dominance of a certain group is the high evaluation it enjoys. If we are correct in assuming that the overall European group dominates we may expect all groups, including those composed of Oriental Jews, to evaluate it most favorably. The various evaluations will help us study "self-hatred" and to determine whether the minority member transfers others' negative feelings toward his minority to himself as well. We shall also note which attributes differentiate between ethnic groups assigned high and low evaluation.

c. Patterns of integration. Attention will be paid to the long-run outlook for change. Are group differences perceived as temporary phenomena of immigration or as a permanent state of affairs? Also, is the process of integration primarily a matter of individual adaptation or of collective action? And how do respondents feel one should go about effecting integration into the general community?

d. Structure of ethnic identification. We shall pay special attention to the comparison between the structure of identity within "Europeans" and within the several Oriental groups. This may lead

In analyzing the situation of the assimilationist, Lewin emphasizes the negative valence of the membership group. 9) The individual wishes to leave the group, but outside pressure will not let him. Identification with his group of origin is not complete or balanced. His membership in it is a central fact of life for him and he is not unaware of sharing its fate; yet, it frustrates his upward mobility. So, he assigns it low or even negative valence.

In discussing ethnic groups one may wonder whether it makes sense to speak of a willingness or desire to belong. But some thought will show that the very inevitability of membership in ethnic groups raises the importance of valence as a component of identification.

Having considered the general theoretical context of the study, let us turn to some of the concrete questions which the data we obtained are supposed to help in answering. The questions are presented in the same order in which they will be treated.

a. Social distance. Some of the problems to which the study of social distance between ethnic groups may contribute are:

1. What is the distance among ethnic groups in Israel compared to that of other countries having many ethnic groups?
2. How appropriate are the various elements of social distances (i.e. marriage, friendship, or neighborliness), and Bogardus' hierarchical principles of social distance to Israel?

to some understanding of differences, if any, between the ethnic identity of majority and minority groups.

c. Relations among variables. In the end we shall turn our attention to relations among variables. First, what is the effect of such variables as length of stay in the country, mobility, religiosity, and feeling of acceptance upon the components of ethnic identification and on social distance among ethnic groups. Next, what are the relations between the components of ethnic identity and some ethnic attitudes, i.e. social distance and the desire for integration in the total society.

II. PROCEDURE

a. Data collection

1. Sampling. The sample includes 675 male and female secondary school pupils, aged 16-17. It also includes 51 of their parents. In our sample we sought to represent the Jewish adolescent population in Israel, but had to introduce certain limitations which restrict the generalizability of results:

From the usual range of adolescence (about 13-18) we chose one grade level composed of subjects aged 16 and 17. In a pilot test we found that younger age groups have difficulty with the questions and older ones are busy getting ready for high school graduation. While the total 16-17 age group includes about 50,000 youngsters, the population from which we sampled contains only those 22,000 who were enrolled in secondary schools supervised by the Ministry of Education.

In view of the subject of the study we were interested in achieving sizable representation of Oriental ethnic groups even though only 25% of the secondary school population has this background. Therefore we sampled only from those schools in which at least 40% of the pupils were of Oriental stock. This is likely to have created a bias since pupils from schools in which the European element forms a great majority are not included in the sample.

The sampling procedure consisted of the selection of 117 schools on a stratified basis and the random selection of 50% of the pupils in the 11th grades of the schools in the sample. The criteria of stratification were: type of school, religiosity of pupils, and time of immigration of most people in the community where school was located.

Type of school: academic, vocational, agricultural.
Religiosity: Yeshiva, religious, secular.
Immigrational recency: according to the census of 1961 communities were classified as "old-time" when 50% or more of its inhabitants immigrated before 1948.

These criteria yielded 18 strata. The sampling ratio was about 1 : 15.

A subsample of 51 pupils was randomly chosen from among the sample. Their parents were then interviewed. The purpose of the parent subsample originally was to allow for intergenerational comparison, but as it turned out some of the most interesting findings of the study were obtained from this sample. (This is understandable when one recalls that the ethnic problem is likely to be more meaningful to parents most of whom were born abroad and are now at work within the larger society than to pupils most of whom were born in Israel and are educated in the deliberately equalitarian school system.) The small size of the parent sample should warn us against generalizing to the wider population or indeed of regarding results as more than suggestive.

2. Questionnaires. After a series of pretests among minority students, soldiers, and high school pupils in Ashkelon two instruments containing 80 questions each were developed. 50 of these were repeated in both questionnaires; 30 were specific to each. The reason for not including all of the questions in a single questionnaire was not to overstep the time allotted by the Ministry of Education. Questionnaire _A_ was administered to 338 subjects: _B_, to 337. In our study we are reporting from both questionnaires so that the _N_ may vary.

The questionnaires were highly structured: 90% of the questions were closed. The forms were administered to entire classes at a time. 25% of the pupils received form _A_; 25% form _B_, and the remaining 50% replied to questions of a different but related research project. In this manner we avoided undue clustering of the sample. Two workers proctored the administration of instruments in each class. They tried to ensure full replies and to prevent communication among subjects during the period of questionnaire administration.

b. Data processing

Data were analyzed at the Hebrew University Computing Center on an I. B. M. computer, Model 7040.[10] Computations fell into three types:

1) Computation of frequency distribution, means, medians, and variances on all questions for purposes of comparing criterion groups.

2) Computation of interrelations among questions measuring the same variable. The index of relation used was *gamma*, a non-linear coefficient of association first proposed by Goodman and Kruksal.[11] On occasion we also made use of scalogram analysis since the scalability of a group of questions points to the uni-dimensionality of the variable underlying them. The interpretation of *gamma* has been discussed by Conster;[12] like the more familiar Pearson *r*, it varies from -1 to +1 in magnitude and permits prediction from one variable to the other. Still, certain differences ought to be remembered: a) *gamma* need not be raised to the power of two in order to account for the variance of one variable present in the other; b) a near perfect *gamma* points to a monotonic, but not necessarily to a linear relationship; c) *gamma* presupposes no more than ordinal measurement. These characteristics of *gamma* make its use appropriate with the kind of assumptions satisfied by the measurement of the present study. Magnitudes of *gamma* significant at the .05 level of significance have been starred by asterisks throughout the study.

III. FINDINGS

a. Inter-ethnic social distance

1. Description of instruments. We studied social distances with the help of an instrument similar to Bogardus' scale of social distance.[13)] The scale is based on the analogy that every man somehow exists at the center of concentric social circles about him. The closer circles denote the more intimate relationships such as marriage while the wider circles represent more distant relationships such as neighborliness or a work association. Access to the more distant circles would seem to presuppose entrance into the more intimate ones. Consequently, the smallest circle to which a subject is willing to admit the member of an ethnic group indicates the distance between him and that ethnic group.

To determine the circles of social distance we used the following questions:

1. Would you be willing to marry someone from group X when the time comes?
    - a. I certainly would
    - b. I would
    - c. I would, but prefer someone of my own ethnic group
    - d. Only someone of my own ethnic group
2. Would you agree to have members of group X as your closest friends?
    - a., b., c., d., - as above
3. How would you feel about your neighbors being members of group X?

a. I would be in complete agreement
b. I would agree
c. I would agree, but would prefer a member of my own group
d. I would agree only to a member of my own ethnic group.

These questions were phrased somewhat differently for the various ethnic groups in Israeli society. Though the questions were worded after Bogardus, results were treated by Guttman's scalogram analysis. 14) This provided an empirical method of testing the degree to which admittance to a more remote circle represented a condition for the admission to a closer one. Tables 1, 2, and 3 help evaluate this problem of a hierarchy.

Table 1

Social Distance from Europeans (Ashkenazic)

In percent

Degree of Intimacy	N	No reply	Certainly would	Would	Prefer own group	Only own group	Median
Marriage	195	4	29	50	15	2	1.88
Friendship	195	4	24	54	16	2	1.94
Neighbors	195	3	30	55	11	1	1.82

Note: Respondents were Orientals

Table 2

Social Distance from Orientals (Sephardic)

In percent

Degree of Intimacy	N	No reply	Certainly would	Would	Prefer own group	Only own group	Median
Marriage	143	1	13	27	38	20	2.76
Friendship	143	1	18	38	38	5	2.14
Neighbors	143	1	22	39	34	3	2.21

Note: Respondents were Europeans

Table 3

Social Distance from Arabs

In percent

Degree of Intimacy	N*	No reply	Certainly would	Would	Prefer own group	Only own group	Particularly not with Arabs	Median
Marriage	337	2	0	2	9	26	61	4.21
Friendship	337	3	1	6	24	33	33	4.07
Neighbors	337	3	2	9	31	26	28	3.80

* All Students

On distances perceived by Orientals from Europeans there is hardly any difference between the three criteria of intimacy (Table 1). As to distances from Orientals, Europeans show slightly greater readiness to be neighbors than marriage partners Table 2). Only when it comes to distance from Arabs is there clear support from group data for the hypothesis of a hierarchy.

Gamma coefficients were computed among the three questions over each of the three samples to ascertain whether the three questions were measuring the same thing. Results are reported in Tables 4-6.

Table 4

Social Distance from Europeans

In gammas

	Marriage	Friendship	Neighbors
Marriage	-	.78*	.65*
Friendship		-	.73*
Neighbors			-

Table 5

Social Distance from Orientals

In *gamma's*

	Marriage	Friendship	Neighbors
Marriage	-	.84*	.85*
Friendship		-	.85*
Neighbors			-

Table 6

Social Distance from Arabs

In *gamma's*

	Marriage	Friendship	Neighbors
Marriage	-	.74*	.65*
Friendship		-	.83*
Neighbors			-

Let us now test Bogardus' principle of concentric circles as a hypothesis rather than treat it as an assumption. For each sample the three questions were scaled by Guttman's procedure.[15)] Coefficients of reproduction were above .90 and therefore satisfied Guttman's criterion of scalability. Tables 7 to 9, in which only non-error scalable combinations are listed, show that in general a certain degree of neighborliness represents a necessary condition for the same degree of friendship, and a certain degree of friendship represents a necessary condition for the same degree of readiness to marry into the other ethnic group.

Table 7

Distance from Europeans

Scale Score	Be neighbors	Be friends	Be marry
1	1	1	1
2	1	2	1
3	1	2	2
4	2	2	2
5	2	2	3
6	2	3	3
7	3	3	3
8	3	3	4

Table 8

Distance from Orientals

Scale Score	Readiness to neighbors	Readiness to friends	Readiness to marry
1	1	1	1
2	1	1	2
3	1	2	2
4	2	2	2
5	2	2	3
6	3	2	2
7	3	3	3
8	3	3	4
9	3	4	4
10	4	4	4

Table 9

Distance from Arabs

Scale Score	Neighbors	Friends	Marry
1	2	2	2
2	2	2	3
3	3	2	3
4	3	3	3
5	3	3	4
6	3	3	5
7	3	4	5
8	3	5	5
9	4	5	5
10	5	5	5

We note that the deviations from the hypothesized order of intimacy are few. We may summarize findings on social distance by concluding that there is indeed a tendency to admit members of other major ethnic groupings according to some order of increasing intimacy. It must be pointed out, however, that there is no absolute condition of acceptance to a lower degree of intimacy, say neighborliness, before acceptance to any higher degree of intimacy, say friendship. Acceptance to a closer circle may become possible at some degree of the wider circle.

2. Comparison among groups. The outstanding phenomenon of social distances in Israel is the lack of symmetry between Europeans (Ashkenazim) and Orientals. 16) Whereas the former maintain considerable distance from the latter (more than 50% are negative toward marriage with Orientals, between 35-40% toward neighborhood and work relations), the distance kept by Orientals from Europeans is much smaller (17% reject marriage, 18% friendship, and only 12% neighborliness). The discriminations against Orientals is specific since Europeans are quite ready to admit members of other European groups to considerable intimacy; only 19% reject marriage with Jews of European stock different from their own. (See Tables 10, 11, 12).

Another phenomenon is the greater distance from non-Jewish than from Jewish ones. There are differences in the degree of reservation about non-Jewish groups. The distance from American Non-Jew is always smaller than from Arab. This reflects the special situation of the Arab minority in Israel. The orientation toward that group is not only the result of direct contact with it, but also of the continuing hostility toward Israel by the surrounding Arab world. Quite a few among the respondents appear to perceive the Israeli Arab as a representative of the hostile Arab world. 17) It is revealing that Druzes, in spite of their status as allies and soldiers in the Israeli Army, are not preferred to other Arabs except very slightly on friendship and neighborliness. 18)

Table 10

Readiness to Marry

In percent

Readiness to marry	N	No reply	Certainly Would	Would	Prefer own Group	Only own Group	Median
Of Europeans with other Europeans of different country	143	2	37	42	16	3	1.8
Of Orientals with other Orientals of different country	195	4	26	49	16	5	1.98
Of Europeans with Orientals	143	1	13	24	38	20	2.84
Of Orientals with Europeans	195	4	29	50	15	2	1.92
Of all Subjects with American Non-Jew	337	3	2	9	23	64	3.75
Of all Subjects with Druze	337	3	0	4	14	79	3.90
Of all Subjects with Arab	337	2	0	2	9	87	3.94

Table 11

Readiness for Friendship

In percent

Readiness for Friendship	N	No reply	Certainly Would	Would	Prefer own Group	Only own Group	Median
Of Orientals with other Orientals of Different country	195	5	27	48	17	4	1.97
Of Europeans with Orientals	143	1	18	38	38	4	2.34
Of Orientals with Europeans	195	4	24	54	16	2	1.98
Of all Subjects with American Non-Jew	337	3	9	21	51	16	2.89
Of all Subjects with Druze	337	2	8	19	40	30	3.07
Of all Subjects with Arab	337	3	2	9	31	54	3.64

Table 12

Readiness for Neighborliness

In percent

Readiness to be Neighbors	N	No reply	Certainly Would	Would	Prefer own Group	Only own Group	Median
Of Orientals with other Orientals of different countries	195	3	26	55	13	3	1.93
Of Europeans with Orientals	143	1	22	39	34	3	2.21
Of Orientals with Europeans	195	3	30	55	11	1	1.86
Of all Subjects with American Non-Jew	337	3	9	21	51	16	2.89
Of all Subjects with Druze	337	2	8	19	40	30	3.07
Of all Subjects with Arab	337	3	2	9	31	54	3.64

It is of interest to compare the orientations of Oriental and European respondents toward Arabs and Druzes. The relative closeness in cultural background between Jewish and non-Jewish Orientals would lead one to expect the social distance between them to be smaller than between Europeans and Arabs/Druzes, but the opposite is true. In Tables 13 and 14 we note that Orientals consistently place more distance between themselves and Arabs and Druzes than do Europeans. Three explanations may fit these data:

a) Oriental Jews have unpleasant historical associations dating from the time they were dispersed among Oriental non-Jews.

b) The greater social distances occur not inspite of but rather because of the relatively greater similarity between fellow Orientals. That is, Arabs and Druzes constitute "marking-off groups" to Oriental Jews. The greater distance comes to demonstrate a desire to be different and affirm one's own identity.

c) Oriental Jews may emphasize their distance from Arabs and Druzes in order to become acceptable to European Jews who also place distance between themselves and the non-Jews. In this way the common Jewish bond is asserted.

3. Scale interrelations. So far we have noted distinct group differences. Members of the dominant group (Europeans) are much more reserved about admitting lower status Orientals to intimacy than the other way around. Moreover, all respondents keep non-Jews at varying, but

Table 13

Orientals and Europeans and Social Distance from Arab - In Percent

Criterion			N	No reply	Certainly would	Would	Prefer own group	Only own group	Particularly not with Arabs	Median
Marriage		Orientals	192	1	0	2	6	24	67	4.76
with	of									
Arab		Europeans	139	0	0	1	13	29	56	4.62
Friendship		Orientals	192	2	0	4	23	24	38	4.17
with	of									
Arab		Europeans	139	1	3	10	17	32	27	3.81
Neighbors		Orientals	192	2	1	7	32	27	32	3.87
with	of									
Arab		Europeans	139	0	4	12	32	27	25	3.57

Table 14

Orientals and Europeans and Social Distance from Druze - In Percent

Criterion			N	No reply	Certainly would	Would	Prefer own group	Only own group	Particularly not with Druzes	Median
Marriage		Orientals	192	1	0	5	11	40	43	4. 35
with	of									
Druze		Europeans	139	1	1	3	17	40	39	4. 22
Friendship		Orientals	192	1	2	17	39	27	15	3. 29
with	of									
Druze		Europeans	139	1	5	24	38	23	9	3. 05
Neighbors		Orientals	192	1	6	17	45	18	13	3. 10
with	of									
Druze		Europeans	139	0	11	23	35	23	8	2. 95

considerable, distance. In addition to group differences one may expect individual differences in the tendency to prejudice.[19] The system of inter-relations between social distances reported in Table 15 supports the hypothesis that there is an individual disposition to social distance: 15 out of 18 correlations are significant. Table 15 is incomplete because some of the questions only applied to either Orientals or Europeans.

Table 15

System of Interrelations between Social Distance Scales

Distance of	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1- Orientals from Orientals				.77*	.27*	.32*	.05
2- Europeans from Europeans			.46*		.24*	.08	.18*
3- Europeans from Orientals					.42*	.52*	.27*
4- Orientals from Europeans					.25*	.27*	.10
5- All Subjects from Am. Non Jew						.65*	.35*
6- All Subjects from Druze							.53*
7- All Subjects from Arabs							

Differences in the relative magnitude of coefficients in Table 15 may be more than random fluctuations. Correlations with distance from Arabs are lower than the rest. Personal response tendencies appear here to be overshadowed by cultural ones. The highest correlation appears, as against this, between distance of Oriental (Jews) and Europeans from Orientals. Here, then, the disposing factor appears to be predominantly personal.

b. Evaluation of Ethnic groups

1. Perceived evaluation. The differential status of the various ethnic groups in Israel ultimately rests on evaluation. The following two questions served to measure perceived evaluations.

> Which of the following statements in your opinion, fits reality best (is closest to the truth)?
>
> 1. Most people in Israel have much higher regard for Orientals than for Europeans.
> 2. Most people in Israel have slightly higher regard for Orientals than for Europeans.
> 3. Most people in Israel have about the same amount of regard for Orientals and Europeans.
> 4. Most people in Israel have slightly higher regard for Europeans than for Orientals.
> 5. Most people in Israel have much higher regard for Europeans than for Orientals
>
> Which of the following statements, in your opinion, fits reality best (is closest to the truth) ?

1. Most people in Israel have a high regard for my ethnic group.
2. Most people in Israel have some regard for my ethnic group.
3. Most people in Israel have little regard for my ethnic group.
4. Most people in Israel do not have any regard for my ethnic group.

Table 16

Perceived evaluation of Orientals and Europeans in Israel

In percent

Ethnic Group	N	No reply	Have regard					Median
			Much more for Oriental	More for Oriental	Same	More for European	Much more for European	
Orientals	192	3	2	4	14	53	25	4.11
Europeans (Ashkenazim)	139	0	0	1	19	51	29	4.08

Table 17

Perceived Evaluation of Subject's Own Group

In percent

Ethnic Group	N	No Reply	High	Some	Little	None	Median
			Regard				
Orientals	192	3	3	34	55	5	2.76
Europeans	139	1	14	66	17	1	2.03

Tables 16 and 17 in which results to the two questions have been summarized show very clearly how preferred Jews of European background are in the judgment of both Europeans and Orientals. Table 16 tells us that between 70% and 80% of all respondents think that Europeans are preferred. From Table 17 one learns that 80% of the Europeans feel that their group enjoys public esteem, while only 37% of the Orientals feel that way.

The striking difference in perceived evaluation leads one to categorize the respondents into dominant and low-status groupings, Europeans and Orientals. In spite of the considerable cultural and social differences within each of these ethnic groupings, differences that call for further analysis by country of origin, the dichotomy between Jews of European and Afro-Asian stock is meaningful from the point of view of the study of ethnic groups in Israel.

2. Measurement of evaluation. We also employed an additional, less direct method for the measurement of evaluation. The idea underlying this method is to define evaluation operationally as the distance of the assessed object from some ideal standard. In other words, we estimate the value of something according to its similarity to the most perfect standard we can imagine.

In order to measure the distance between an ideal type and certain ethnic stereotypes we utilized the semantic differential methodology developed by Osgood, et al. 20) Elsewhere in the present series of studies the use of the semantic differential as a method for assessing the meaning of ethnic stereotypes has been fully described. In the following section we shall describe our own adaptation of the method to our specific purpose.

The objective of the following computation is to assign each respondent a score for each stereotype. The rationale of the score, as has been mentioned, is the distance he perceives between the stereotype and an ideal type. The simplest form of the computation is the summation of differences in ratings over all bipolar adjective pairs.

$$(1) \quad D_{(1)} = \sum_{1}^{K} (I_j - E_j)$$

where K represents the number of adjective pairs

I_j, the ideal score on the adjective pair j

E_j, the score assigned to stereotype E on j.

To correct for the number of adjective scales used we divide by K.

$$(2) \quad D_{(2)} = \frac{\sum_{1}^{K} (I_j - E_j)}{K}$$

As a next step we square the differences as in the computation of variances and for similar reasons. We obtain

$$(3) \quad D_{(3)} = \frac{\sum_{1}^{K} (I_j - E_j)^2}{K}$$

The fact that on any one adjective dimension the ideal score may be a middling or an extreme value automatically limits the magnitude of any possible discrepancy. In order to neutralize this limitation we divided every difference between E_j and I_j by the maximum difference that could have arisen. We now have

$$(4) \qquad D_{(4)} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{1}^{K} \frac{(I_j - E_j)^2}{(I_j - E_j \, \mathrm{max})^2}}{K}}$$

$D_{(4)}$ may vary between 0 and 1 (when discrepancies are maximized). In order to permit 1 to express the most favorable evaluation we subtracted $D_{(4)}$ from unity (1.0):

$$(5) \qquad D_{(5)} = \mathrm{Die} = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{{}_{1}^{K} \frac{(I_j - E_j)^2}{(I_j - E_j \, \mathrm{max})^2}}{K}}$$

A *Die* score is computed for each individual and each stereotype. Such scores can be summed and averaged:

$$(6) \qquad \mathrm{Die} = \frac{\sum_{1}^{N} \mathrm{Die}}{N}$$

where N is the number of people in the sample.

Findings. To give some picture of the way the various ethnic groups were evaluated Table 18 summarizes mean evaluative scores for each group.

Table 18

Evaluation of Ethnic Groups

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations

Subjects evaluating	Typical Israeli	Ashkenazi	Oriental	Yemenite	Moroccan	Arab	Own Group	Self
Oriental Jews	.70 (.18)	.63 (.20)	.60 (.20)	.60 (.22)	.52 (.24)	.37 (.24)	.67 (.20)	.75 (.16)
European Jews	.69 (.17)	.72 (.15)	.48 (.22)	.55 (.22)	.42 (.24)	.34 (.22)	.74 (.15)	.74 (.16)

Table 3 reveals a hierarchy of evaluation that in many respects is agreed upon by both criterion groups. The self is first, the respondent's own group (in the narrow sense) enjoys great favor, the Yemenite is preferred to theMoroccan Jew, and the Arab closes the list. But certain differences can not be ignored. For example, members of the dominant group do not evaluate the self differently from the own-group, while members of the Oriental groups evaluate their selves more favorably than any stereotype including own-group. Also, the Ashkenazi prefers his own ethnic group to the image of the typical Israeli which to him may seem adulterated by a mixture of all groups. The Oriental, as against this, prefers the national image of the typical Israeli as it includes all other groups, including his own.

The differential evaluation will become more meaningful if we specify the attributes ascribed to the various groups. In Tables 19 and 20 mean scores have been listed for each adjective pair and each stereotype. Since Ideal Type serves as a standard it is interesting to note which attributes are most polarized on it. Beginning from the most positive they are pleasant, industrious, clever, practical, and sociable. When one pole of an adjective pair connotes an Ideal Type we may think of that adjective pair as evaluative. Such other pairs as lenient-strict, traditional-progressive, and moderate-hot tempered elicit intermediate ratings which indicates that they represent non-evaluative dimensions. This supports Osgood's contention that evaluation, is the most prominent but not the only dimension of connotative meaning.(21)

As has already been gathered from Table 17 both kinds of respondents have similarly favorable pictures of their selves, but a comparison of Tables 18 and 19 shows that Orientals are more critical of their own group than are Europeans. The focus of self criticism centers about the progressive-traditional attribute. The Orientals' Own Group is clearly less progressive than Ideal Type or Me as I am. The discrepancy between evaluation of self and of own group points to a kind of self hatred, a partial dissociation from own group.

To round out the picture it may be well to present findings by country of origin. In Table 21 respondents have been identified as of Yemenite, Moroccan, or Eastern European stock and their mutual mean ratings listed.

Table 19

Stereotypes and Mean Ratings. Oriental Respondents

Scales	Israeli	Oriental Jew	Yemenite	Moroccan	Ashkenazi	Arab	Own Group	Me as I am	Ideal Type	M	Opposites
Unsociable	5.83	5.43	5.48	4.63	5.00	3.72	5.75	6.06	6.39	5.36	Sociable
Industrious	5.40	5.62	5.02	4.75	4.74	4.46	5.77	5.49	6.52	5.42	Lazy
Pleasant	5.49	5.32	5.34	4.53	5.19	3.24	5.57	5.96	6.60	5.25	Unpleasant
Weak	5.40	5.59	4.84	5.63	3.89	5.01	5.47	4.83	5.84	5.07	Strong
Lenient	3.94	3.88	3.97	3.14	3.68	3.20	4.02	4.67	4.57	3.90	Strict
Unpractical	5.52	5.43	5.67	4.68	4.96	4.23	5.56	5.77	6.53	5.35	Practical
Progressive	5.36	3.03	2.75	3.54	5.23	2.47	3.75	5.11	5.28	4.04	Traditional
Moderate	3.95	3.19	4.36	2.39	5,16	2.48	3.71	4.70	5.30	3.91	Hot Tempered
Constrained	5.76	3.99	3.88	4.93	4.96	3.99	4.40	4.86	5.25	4.67	Free
Unclever	5.93	5.27	5.31	4.92	5.64	3.32	5.64	5.67	6.53	5.36	Clever
Beautiful	5.19	4.80	3.98	4.96	5.44	3.25	5.06	5.10	5.86	4.85	Ugly
Warm	4.74	5.13	4.39	5.54	3.55	5.27	4.88	4.33	4.08	4.66	Cold
	3.80	3.77	3.80	3.67	4.04	2.68	3.82	4.01	3.99	3.84	

Note: The direction in which adjective pairs were presented has been preserved in this table. Mean scores have been so computed as to insure that high scores are associated with the positive pole.

Table 20

Stereotypes and Mean Ratings. European Respondents

Scales	Israeli	Oriental Jew	Yemenite	Moroccan	Ashkenazi	Arab	Own Group	Me as I am	Ideal Type	M	Opposites
Unsociable	5.58	4.93	5.41	3.59	5.31	3.69	5.52	5.62	6.44	5.12	Sociable
Industrious	5.32	4.72	5.89	3.79	5.31	3.97	5.56	5.06	6.67	5.14	Lazy
Pleasant	5.50	4.48	5.36	3.70	5.09	3.20	5.78	5.76	6.77	5.14	Unpleasant
Weak	5.34	5.33	4.04	5.58	4.64	5.00	4.86	4.64	5.93	5.04	Strong
Lenient	3.82	3.58	4.39	2.92	3.69	3.27	3.66	4.23	4.26	3.76	Strict
Unpractical	5.65	4.48	4.98	4.14	5.64	3.68	5.68	5.76	6.62	5.18	Practical
Progressive	5.32	2.52	2.30	3.43	5.31	2.63	5.29	5.17	5.27	4.14	Traditional
Moderate	3.74	2.46	4.50	1.99	1.93	2.47	4.88	4.42	4.99	3.62	Hot-tempered
Constrained	6.08	4.06	3.69	5.03	5.03	4.03	[illegible]05	5.13	5.33	4.82	Free
Unclever	5.68	4.16	4.85	4.02	6.00	3.08	5.98	5.50	6.57	5.09	Clever
Beautiful	5.19	4.44	4.04	4.20	5.28	3.09	5.38	5.08	5.92	4.74	Ugly
Warm	5.05	5.17	4.38	5.42	4.13	5.00	4.29	4.51	4.45	4.71	Cold
	3.80	3.70	3.99	3.59	3.98	3.68	3.98	3.96	3.95	3.85	

Table 21

Self and Mutual Evaluation by Country of Origin

Country of Origin of Those Evaluating	Those evaluated			
	Yemenite	Moroccan	Eastern Europe	N
Yemen	7.33	6.30	7.33	33
Morocco	6.00	7.15	6.89	74
Eastern Europe	6.33	4.90	8.08	107

These findings reinforce those previously cited. Each ethnic group, even when country of origin becomes the basis for categorization, tends to regard its own highly, but Eastern Europeans regard themselves and are regarded by the average of others, most highly of all. On the whole, the judgment of the Europeans becomes a standard. 22)

3. Scale interrelations. Table 22 lists intercorrelations between evaluations of stereotypes (Die). The coefficients are gamma's. The value appearing in the upper right of each cell refers to gamma's taken over Orientals only; in the lower right, over Europeans only; the value on the left, over the whole sample.

24 of 28 coefficients, taken over the whole sample, are significant, and there is not one negative correlation. The generalized response tendency to evaluation includes the more specifically ethnic stereotypes, over the mere generally national ones, and over the self. This gives further support to the hypothesis that psychological factors interact with

Table 22 – Intercorrelations of Evaluation (Die) – In gamma's

Me as I am	My own group	Arab	Ashken.	Moroccan	Yemenite	Oriental	Israeli	
.41* .45* .52*	.39* .41* .40*	.17* .20* .23	.35* .57* .46	.30* .29* .26	.23* .24* .24*	.37* .32* .26		Israeli
.46* .32* .01	.64* .35 .04	.34* .32* .53*	.24* .20* .05	.48* .52* .52*	.41* .44* .35			Oriental
.27* .26* .24	.51* .37* .23	.63* .37* .43*	.26* .21* .23	.31* .31* .25*				Yemenite
.36* .27* .14	.50* .30* .06	.30* .39* .51*	.26* .13 .07					Moroccan
.38* .41* .55*	.35* .56* .89*	.05 .06 .11						Ashkenazic
.12 .13 .13	.27* .20* .11							Arab
.51* .51* .56*								My own group
								Me as I am

cultural norms in the formation of group prejudice. In view of this it becomes all the more interesting to consider those cases where correlations are relatively low.

Beginning with relations with the self one notes the low coefficients with Arab, for both criterion groups. Next, Europeans do not relate self-evaluation to evaluation of Orientals, while there is no corresponding tendency on the part of Orientals to dissociate self-evaluation from regard for Europeans. This again points to the lack of symmetry stressed before. The same asymmetry obtains with Own Group: low or zero correlations with Oriental stereotypes for Europeans; moderate correlations with Ashkenazic ones for Orientals. For both kinds of subjects Ashkenazi forms low correlations with non-Ashkenazic types. This seems to show that cultural norms about dominance of the European group and the low status of the Orientals can be strong enough to overcome psychological response tendencies toward a generalized prejudice.

c. Preferred patterns of group integration

1. The desire to integrate. The concept of pluralism is based on the justification of group differences. In a pluralistic society individuals may with impunity belong to both their ethnic group and the wider society. As against this, the monolithic society rejects the legitimacy of group differences. Aware of the need for a series of questions on this issue we asked only one, hoping to get a glimpse of the prevailing view on the monolithic-pluralistic issue:

Do you feel that ethnic group differences in Israel ought to disappear?

1. Yes, they should disappear.
2. Certain differences should disappear but the different traditions should remain.
3. No, they should not disappear.

The frequency distributions reported in Table 23 will only give a very general and tenuous idea of views on this important question.

Table 23

The Desire for the Disappearance of Group Differences

In percent

Subjects			Differences			
			Should Disappear	But Traditions Should remain	Should not disappear	
	Score	0	1	2	3	Median
Pupils	N					
Orientals	195	0	75	24	2	1.16
Europeans	143	0	64	34	2	1.23
All Ss	338	0	70	28	2	1.21
Parents						
Orientals	31	13	68	19	0	1.13
Europeans	20	0	90	10	0	1.05
All Ss	51	8	76	16	0	1.10

Table 23 shows that the great majority of respondents are interested in the disappearance of group differences. A minority favors the retention of some differences, while there is no support for massive amounts of pluralism. Among the younger generation it is the Orientals who are the strongest advocates of integration which runs counter to a common notion that the dominant group forces its values on the disadvantaged.[23)] Among elders, a small group of course, the relation is reversed. There it is the members of the dominant group who are somewhat more in favor of a reduction to the common cultural denominator.

2. Ways of integration. What are the ways in which subjects wich to seek the integration they so overwhelmingly favor? This problem was thought to center on two dimensions: a) Collectivism vs. Individualism, b) Aggressiveness vs. Gradualness. The following questions operatioalized these dimensions:

My ethnic group will achieve its rights only if it organizes and acts in unison:

1. Fully agree
2. Agree
3. Do not agree
4. Am strongly opposed

To solve the ethnic problems one must

1. Exert force against every sign of discrimination.
2. Fight, but without the use of force.
3. Use only means of education and explanation.
4. Do nothing because in time the problem will solve itself.
5. There is no ethnic discrimination in Israel, and therefore there is no need to do anything.

Table 24

Desire for Group Action

In percent

		N	No Reply	Fully agree	Agree	Do not agree	Am opposed	Median
			0	1	2	3	4	
Pupils	Orientals	195	1	25	30	31	13	2. 33
	Europeans	143	0	14	27	40	19	2. 72
	All pupils	338	1	20	29	35	15	2. 52
Parents	Orientals	31	13	29	35	13	10	1. 91
	Europeans	20	10	10	40	20	20	2. 37
	All parents	51	12	22	37	16	14	2. 09

Table 25

Type of Action

In percent

		N	No Reply	Use force	No force	Education	Wait	No problem	Median
			0	1	2	3	4	5	
Pupils	Orientals	195	0	7	11	53	23	7	3. 10
	Europeans	143	0	0	10	57	24	6	3. 14
	All pupils	338	0	5	10	54	23	7	3. 14
Parents	Orientals	31	13	0	10	71	6	0	2.97
	Europeans	20	5	0	0	65	20	10	3. 23
	All parents	51	10	0	6	69	12	4	3. 06

The general picture is one of normal distributions in Tables 24 and 25, that is of intermediate response by the majority of respondents. Certain points stand out from group comparisons: Orientals more than Europeans and Oriental parents more than children tend to be collectivistic. The difference between Orientals and Europeans may arise from culture patterns; between Oriental parents and their children, to a gradual breaking-up of such patterns among the young. Older Orientals may also think of collectivism as a political weapon when numbers favor the group (as they do for Orientals). A peculiar feature of Table 24 is the greater tendency of the young among Europeans than among parents to collectivism. It is difficult to account for this isolated finding.

As to the means to be adopted in the struggle for integration no more than an insignificant minority supports the use of force. Even struggle without force enjoys the agreement of no more than 10%. The great majority of respondents prefer education and explanation; 16-30% discount the problem or feel it simply does not exist. Frequency distributions among the young do not reveal any ethnic difference, but among parents there are signs of somewhat greater impatience among the Orientals. European parents more than Orientals put their faith in the passage of time, but one should not place too much weight on the small parent sample.

One may conclude this section by noting the relative preference for group action among Orientals in an area of human relations which should, and appears to, occupy them more than the dominant group.

d. Actual patterns of integration

1. The feeling of acceptance. The degree to which low-status people are held to be acceptable is one possible predictor of their actual or eventual acceptance. Subjects were asked whether they thought Ashkenazim were ready to marry Orientals, and four answers could be given: 1) All Ashkenazim are ready, 2) Most are ready, 3) A minority are ready, 4) None are ready. Questions on neighborliness and friendship were phrased in parallel fashion. It will be recalled that similar questions were asked about social distance. But here we looked for the perception of norms rather than opinion.

Table 26

Perceived Acceptance of Orientals by Europeans

In percent

		N	No reply	All Ashkenazim ready	Most ready	Few ready	None ready	Median
Pupils	Marriage	192	1	1	40	56	2	2.66
	Friendship	192	1	3	34	61	1	2.71
	Neighbors	192	2	2	31	61	4	2.77
Parents	Marriage	20	0	0	25	75	0	2.83
	Friendship	20	0	10	40	50	0	2.50
	Neighbors	20	0	10	45	45	0	2.38

As one might expect from the way the questions were worded extreme categories (All Ashkenazim; No Ashkenazim) are almost empty. Differences center about the intermediate (Most-Few) ones. The modal category is that "few Ashkenazim are considered ready" to accept Orientals to the three degrees of social contact. Thus, perceived social distance is rather great. What is especially interesting is that actual social distances (Tables 10, 11, 12) are smaller than perceived ones. It should be remembered, however, that the estimate of actual social distance came from a sample of 11th grade high school pupils. While the question of perceived distance refers to Ashkenazim, in general Ashkenazic pupils in the sample could be more enlightened than the Ashkenazic population, which would account for the gap between actual and perceived distance noted here.

2. Social mobility. Another criterion of integration is the likelihood that low status members will be able to realize their occupational aspirations. As in other parts of this study we tried to assess a subjective likelihood. Two questions served this end:

> When you think of your future, do you feel that you have a good chance of finding the kind of work that you are really interested in?
>
> 1. Very good chance
> 2. Good chance
> 3. Not such good chance
> 5. No chance at all.

Do you think that in the future you have better earning chances than your father does today?

1. Much better
2. A little better
3. The same
4. Less

Parents received questions worded to inquire into the chances they attributed to their children. Tables 27 and 28 summarize the relevant data.

The picture one obtains is optimistic. Most feel they have good or fairly good chances to achieve in life and to earn more than their parents do today. Parents are even more optimistic than their sons and daughters. There does not seem to be any difference in expectations between Orientals and Europeans in the sample, though of course levels of aspiration may be somewhat lower among Orientals.

While informal social discrimination seems to be, as has been shown, a real and conscious problem the same can not be said for the expectation of social mobility.

e. Ethnic Identification

The ethnic subidentity includes a number of ethnic identifications. Each of these contains systems of orientations toward ethnic groups. It may be recalled that we chose to investigate three dimensions of identification: centrality, solidarity, and valence, and there may be others. It seems, however, that these three cover a good part of the

Table 27

Chances of finding Work of Choice

In percent

		N	No reply	Very good chance	Good chance	Not such Good chances	Almost none	None	Median
				1	2	3	4	5	
Pupils	Orientals	195	2	17	66	14	1	1	1.98
	Europeans	143	0	17	76	8	0	0	1.93
Parents	Orientals	31	13	39	48	0	0	0	1.59
	Europeans	20	5	20	65	5	5	0	1.92

Table 28

Earning Power

In percent

		N	No reply	Much more	A little more	Same	Less	Median
				1	2	3	4	
Pupils	Orientals	195	4	38	37	14	7	1.63
	Europeans	143	1	28	44	18	8	2.00
Parents	Orientals	31	13	58	29	0	0	1.25
	Europeans	20	0	60	20	15	5	1.33

construct and, what is more important, add to an understanding of intergroup relations.

1. Centrality. Two questions were chosen to operationalize centrality:

Do you often think of being a member of your ethnic group?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. Seldom
4. Never .

Does the fact of your being a member of your ethnic group influence many of the things that you say or do?

1. Many things
2. Several things
3. Few things
4. Nothing.

The first question follows Newcomb, Turner, and Converse (1965) who state

> If we had a means of recording all conscious thoughts in an individual's mind, centrality would be very closely related to the simple frequency with which the object occurs to the person.[24)]

Since we have no such means either, we formulated the first question in the form of an appeal to the subject to recall the frequency with which his ethnic group occurs to him. We have here something that may be called "cognitive" centrality. The second question leans more directly on Lewin's thinking and defines centrality as the connectedness of one region with others in life space. Here, too, we relied on subjective interpretation. Since subjects are required to estimate the influence of the ethnic group on what they say or do, we have called this aspect of centrality "behavioral." Findings show that the distinction is justified. Table 29 and 30 list frequency distributions:

Table 29

Cognitive Centrality

In percent

Subjects Score	N	No Reply	Often 1	Sometimes 2	Seldom 3	Never 4	Median
Pupils							
Orientals	196	0	21	35	24	20	2.32
Europeans	144	0	13	33	31	24	2.62
Parents							
Orientals	31	13	35	23	19	10	1.87
Europeans	20	5	25	20	0	50	3.55

Table 30

Behavioral Centrality

In percent

Subjects	N	No Reply	Influences Many Things	Several Things	Few Things	Nothing	Median
Pupils							
Orientals	196	0	5	22	22	50	3.50
Europeans	144	0	3	23	27	47	3.38
Parents							
Orientals	31	13	13	13	16	45	3.53
Europeans	20	10	15	20	5	50	3.60

Cognitive centrality is greater than its behavioral counterpart with all categories of subjects. This may follow from the fact that thoughts are more sensitive to stimulation than action. It may also reflect some norm that discredits the legitimacy of ethnic motives in overt behavior. There may be other explanations as well.

2. Solidarity. This is the feeling of involvement in the achievements and failures of a group. In K. Lewin's sense, a person is solidary with his group to the extent that he is positively dependent on it. 25) Two questions were put to respondents:

> When your ethnic group is insulted, do you feel as if you had been insulted yourself?
>
> 1. Always
> 2. Often
> 3. Seldom
> 4. Never
>
> When your ethnic group is praised do you feel as if you had been praised yourself?
>
> 1. Always
> 2. Often
> 3. Seldom
> 4. Never

We shall refer to the two themes brought out in these questions as solidarity in insult and solidarity in praise. Results are summarized in Tables 31 and 32.

Table 31

Solidarity in Insult

In percent

Subjects Score	N	No Reply	Always 1	Often 2	Seldom 3	Never 4	Median
Pupils							
Orientals	195	0	20	31	20	21	2.50
Europeans	143	0	12	21	35	32	3.00
Parents							
Orientals	31	13	58	6	10	13	1.25
Europeans	20	5	20	5	30	40	3.25

Table 32

Solidarity in Praise

In percent

Subjects Score	N	No Reply	Always 1	Often 2	Seldom 3	Never 4	Median
Pupils							
Orientals	195	1	17	24	33	25	2.77
Europeans	143	0	10	12	38	40	3.23
Parents							
Orientals	31	13	65	6	3	13	1.16
Europeans	20	0	25	10	15	50	3.50

In general, insult elicits greater solidarity than does praise. This is in keeping with the recurring finding that a group is more cohesive when attacked than when left in peace. 26) Yet, the correlation between the two kinds of solidarity reaches $\gamma = .64$. We also note a striking difference between criterion groups in both kinds of solidarity, especially among parents. The low-status group is much more solidarity-prone than the dominant one.

3. Valence. A further criterion of group identification is the individual's willingness to belong to the group, its attractiveness for him. This is valence. With a group into which one is born it is difficult to establish valence. We tried to overcome this difficulty by asking a direct and an indirect question:

> Are you glad that you are a member of your ethnic group?
>
> 1. Very glad
> 2. Glad
> 3. Indifferent
> 4. Sorry
> 5. Very sorry.
>
> If you could be born over again would you again wish to be a a member of your ethnic group?
>
> 1. Very much
> 2. Yes
> 3. Don't care
> 4. No

Findings are summarized in Tables 33 and 34.

Table 33

"Are you glad to be a member of your ethnic group?"
In percent

Subjects	N	No Reply	Very Glad	Glad	Indif-ferent	Sorry	Very Sorry	Median
Score			1	2	3	4	5	
Pupils								
Orientals	195	0	21	30	45	4	1	2.50
Europeans	143	0	19	34	47	1	0	2.41
Parents								
Orientals	31	13	3	58	23	0	3	2.18
Europeans	20	5	15	20	55	5	0	2.72

Table 34

"If you were to be born over again, would you again
wish to be a member of your group?"
In percent

Subjects Score	N	No Reply 1	Very Much 2	Yes 3	Don't Care 4	No	Median
Pupils							
Orientals	195	0	14	14	61	11	2.86
Europeans	143	0	20	24	54	2	2.61
Parents							
Orientals	31	13	16	19	32	19	2.76
Europeans	20	5	10	15	55	15	2.90

The main impression here is that with a large segment of respondents, especially the younger ones, ethnicity is a matter of indifference. It is also possible that the wording of the question led to a piling up of responses in the "indifferent, don't care" categories. This suggestion receives some support from the fact that on a parallel question concerning the valence of both Jewishness and Israeliness (N = 338) 50% of the replies occurred in the most favorable category. Coming back to the valence of ethnicity it may be observed that among the young it is greater for the European sub-sample, while among parents the trend is opposite. The reasonable expectation that ethnic valence is greater in the dominant group receives confirmation among the young, but not among their elders. Again, the small size of the parent sample should put us on our guard against undue speculation.

4. Interrelations among components of identification. If we are right in regarding centrality, solidarity, and valence as three aspects (or components) of identification they should be found to be positively intercorrelated. From Table 35 we see that among 12 coefficients 11 are positive and six significant. There is an interesting difference between the patterns of intercorrelation of the two criterion groups. The ethnic identification of Europeans is of one piece while that of the Orientals is broken by the dissociation of valence from centrality and solidarity. 27) It is fair to state that group membership represents a privilege to the dominant group and is therefore regarded with favor;

hence, centrality, solidarity, and valence are connected. Minority members to whom group membership is a burden foisted on them by fate will experience it as a central fact that coerces them into solidarity, but there is no reason to suppose that they should also find it attractive. They may or they may not; low correlation follows.

Table 35

Intercorrelations of Components: Ethnic Identification

Pupils Only

	Orientals (N = 195)				Europeans (N = 143)			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. Cognitive Centrality	-	.44*	.29*	.15	-	.58*	.31*	.34*
2. Behavioral Centrality		-	.26*	-.04		-	.27*	.28
3. Solidarity			-	.21			-	.25
4. Valence				-				-

5. Narrow and Broad Ethnic Identification. In Israel, as has been stated, ethnic groups are defined by place of origin. But the question remains of what constitutes the range of "place" of origin. The smallest unit of analysis employed in this study is country of origin. We could have chosen subgroups from within countries. There sometimes are important differences between localities within a country, and those originating in them make a case of the difference, maintain

different customs, speak dialects, and so forth. For example, in Morocco there are important distinctions between city Jews and Jews from the Atlas Mountains. On the other hand, there are cases where clusters of several countries constitute a cultural unit; i. e. Jews of Eastern Europe (with reservations !) or of South America. The usual distinction when broad categories are preferred is by continent of origin, with Jews from Europe considered one major grouping and Jews from Asia and Africa, another. This division seeks justification in the differential orientation toward the European culture. It has been challenged by those investigators who are impressed with the great heterogeneity of the Oriental subgroups.

In our work we have followed the method of subdividing by continents since this conformed with levels of evaluation, as has been shown. In order to legitimize this conception further we asked questions of Solidarity in Insult, Solidarity in Praise, and Valence, with the broader ethnic groupings (Orientals, Europeans) as objects, and then intercorrelated responses with those obtained from asking the corresponding question when the object was "own ethnic group." (See Tables 31, 32 and 34). Coefficients of correlation are reported in Table 36.

It is clear that there is a strong correlation between broadly and narrowly based ethnic identification. Psychologically, if not historically or culturally, the Oriental and European groupings have become large ethnic clusters. Those who identify with a country of origin also identify with the continent of origin. Specific cultural differences in local background notwithstanding, social status associated with the broader groupings appears to be the potent factor in patterns of identification.

Table 36

Correlations between Aspects of Narrow and Broad Bases for Ethnicity

Subjects	Topic	Solidarity in Praise	Solidarity in Insult	Valence
		With own ethnic group		
Orientals	Solidarity in Praise with Orientals	.73*		
	Solidarity in Insult		.64*	
	Valence			.79*
Europeans	Solidarity in Praise with Europeans	.78*		
	Solidarity in Insult		.73*	
	Valence			.66*

f. Relations among variables

Up to now we have compared the frequency distributions of criterion groups (Oriental Jews – European Jews; pupils – parents) on each variable in turn. In addition, we have considered the interrelation of variable components and found them significant to a large extent. We shall now turn to correlations between classes of variables and may anticipate the discussion by stating that they are weaker than those found within variables. It must of course be pointed out that statistically speaking intercorrelations within components of a variable set some kind of ceiling to correlations between the variables. What remains is a range of possibilities as to how close one gets to the ceiling.

In spite of the usual reservations about division into independent and dependent variables in a study that is non-experimental it is conceptually convenient to think of such variables as Length of Stay in Country, Social Mobility, and Feeling of Acceptance as forming a class of antecedent (independent) variables, of such others as Social Distance and Preferred Patterns of Integration as outcome (dependent) variables, and of Ethnic Identification as an intervening variable. The components of ethnic identification are conceived as a mediator in interaction with certain antecedents. Let us first consider covariation with the several antecedents:

1. Length of Stay in Country. All of the Jewish ethnic groups originate abroad. We should therefore expect a relation between length of stay and group identification. Specifically, due to the gradual integration into the larger society the relation should be negative. In fact, among pupils there were significant gamma's of -.27 and -.26 with Behavioral Centrality for Europeans and Orientals, respectively. With parents, relations are more pronounced, in spite of the small sample (Table 37).

Table 37

Length of Stay in Country and Ethnic Identification

Parents (N = 51)

Subjects	N	Behavioral Centrality	Cognitive Centrality	Combined Solidarity
Orientals	31	-. 42*	-. 47*	-. 53*
Europeans	20	-. 64*	-. 20	-. 08

There are a few other significant correlations with Length of Stay, but their isolation raises doubts of spuriousness.

2. Feeling of Acceptance. The minority member who sees himself frustrated in his attempts to be accepted by the majority may seek refuge in ethnic identification. Hence, one may hypothesize a negative correlation between Feeling of Acceptance and identification in the case of Orientals. A number of results support this: The lower the feeling acceptance by Europeans (a composite Bogardus scale) the greater Solidarity in Insult and Praise (-. 34*) and the greater Behavioral Centrality of the ethnic group (-. 23*). There is also a negative correlation between Feeling of Acceptance and Integration by Group Action (-. 35*).

3. Perceived evaluation. This is not far from Feeling of Acceptance. In fact, the correlation between the two is gamma = . 37* among Oriental

youngsters and .35* among Europeans. While perceived evaluation bears no relation to centrality and solidarity there is a significant and positive correlation with valence for both Orientals and European pupils. (.41 and .36, respectively). Valence, or the desire to be born again as a member of the same ethnic group, reflects the reputed status of the group. Here again we note the split between two components of identification, centrality and solidarity, on the one hand, and valence, on the other. The importance to one of being a member of a certain ethnic group and the sense of solidarity one feels with that group may be outcomes of this situation, but whether or not he finds the inevitable attractive may be dependent on the reputation the group enjoys. 28) Centrality and solidarity rise as a result of frustration; valence, as a result of satisfaction.

4. Social mobility. On the assumption that mobility will have its effect only after some experience with the struggle for economic existence, correlations were computed only for the parent sample. The small number of subjects in the sample does not seem to warrant extended treatment, and we may confine ourselves to the finding that the feeling that one's children have a chance for achieving their vocational objectives seems to have a negative effect on several components of ethnic identification. The better the outlook the smaller the necessity of finding refuge in the group. And the opposite, when parents think their offspring are thwarted in their prospects their own need for group identification rises. The correlation of -.58 between social mobility and group action tendencies points

in the same direction. The greater chance of mobility obviates the necessity for collective action.

5. Family ties. How do family ties with members of other ethnic groups affect ethnic identification? (The question that aided us in replying to this question was: Is someone in your family married to someone outside your ethnic group?). It would seem that intermarriage should favor the supra-ethnic, national basis for identification and discourage ethnicity. The following table (Table 38) confirms this for the parent sample, but not for the pupils. With young people family ties may not yet have had their effect. Anyway, one must here consider the possibility of a reversal in variables: weak ethnicity may lead to intermarriage. This whole issue of family ties and ethnic identification bears further investigation. The present findings are suggestive, but inconclusive.

Table 38

Family Ties and Components of Ethnic Identification

(*Gamma*'s)

Subjects	Cognitive Centrality	Behavioral Centrality	Combined Solidarity	Valence
Pupils				
Orientals	.13	.12	.21	.04
Europeans	.11	.19	.07	.19
Parents				
Orientals	.57*	.67*	.04	.87*
Europeans	.54*	.66*	.24	.34

6. Religious observance. The last "independent" variable to be considered is religious observance. Respondents were asked to define themselves as one of the following:

a. Very religious
b. Religious
c. Traditionalist
d. Not religious
e. Anti-religious

What can we expect the relation between religion and ethnic identification to be? On the one hand, the Jewish religion should be a supra-ethnic force for unity much like intermarriage. On the other hand, isolation of the major ethnic groupings for many centuries generated certain local differences in religious observance which may have strengthened ethnicity. To get some notion of whether religion reinforces ethnic ties or weakens them one must turn to empirical findings. In general, these support a hypothesis stating a relation, but some of the evidence is contradictory. For a sample of findings supporting the hypothesis:

a. With parents, religious observance is positively and significantly related to cognitive centrality (.41*) and behavioral centrality (.50*).

b. With pupils there is a negative relation with the desire for the disappearance of ethnic differences (-.29*).

c. Table 39 summarizes a number of correlations with social distance.

Table 39

Religious Observance and Social Distance

Relation	Oriental Pupils N = 195	European Pupils N = 143
Religious Observance and		
1. Distance from Druzes	-.50*	-.51*
2. Distance from American Non Jew	-.61*	-.56*
3. Distance from Arabs	-.12	-.34*
4. Distance from Oriental Jews		-.27*
5. Distance from Ashkenazim	-.18	
6. Distance from other Oriental Groups	-.10	
7. Distance from other European Groups		-.30*

The fact that correlations are higher with distance from non-Jewish groups indicates the predominantly national character of the Jewish religion. It will be noted that coefficients remain significant for Europeans even when distance is from Jewish groups. The presence of a relation between religiosity and distance from Druzes, but not from Arabs among Orientals, may show that with respect to Arabs forces other than religiosity are powerful enough to confound its effect. Let us now turn to a few relations between what have been called intervening and outcome variables. Here, the direction of causation becomes even more problematic, and we shall limit our interest to functional relations.

7. Ethnic identification and Social distance. The main social psychological function of ethnic identification is, in our opinion, a person' ties with certain ethnic group as opposed to his reservations about others. On this basis one ought to find negative correlations between ethnic identification and social distance. Table 40 summarizes correlations taken over Orientals and Europeans whatever is appropriate. Though not all of the coefficients are significant all but one are in the expected direction and may be taken as cumulative evidence for the position that the ethnic defines himself by marking himself off from others.

Table 40

Social Distance and Ethnic Identification (Pupils)

	Distance from Other Oriental Groups	Europeans	Other Ashkenazic Groups	Orientals
Cognitive Centrality	-.25*	-.20	-.28*	-.36*
Behavioral Centrality	-.20	-.20	-.19	-.23
Combined Solidarity	-.29*	-.24*	-.21	-.11
Valence	-.12	-.14	-.06	-.39*

8. Ethnic identification and the desire for group action. The *gamma*'s reported in Table 41 support the plausible expectation that individuals having strong ethnic group ties will seek redress for their goal and imagined grievances by group action.

Table 41

Group Action and Ethnic Identification

	Group Action and			
Subjects	Cognitive Centrality	Behavioral Centrality	Combined Solidarity	Valence
Oriental Pupils	.32*	.28*	.39*	.25*
European Pupils	.24	.24	.36*	.08
Parents	.41*	.27	.54*	.23

9. Social distance and the desirability of group differences. Inter-ethnic social distance is for the dominant group related to the affirmation of group differences. For the minority, social distance is apparently unrelated to attitudes about group differences, to judge by response of our Oriental sample (Table 42). These findings bear relevance to the image of a pluralistic society. European youth may not share the pluralistic dream. The more liberal they are, that is the less distance they place between themselves and Orientals, the less desirable they deem group differences to be. And the opposite, the more prejudiced they are the more they favor the desirability

of group differences. Ethnic pluralism to them is something that goes with inter-group distance. The social image of the liberal members of the dominant group then would seem to affirm the melting pot image of supra-ethnic nationalism, rather than that of Unity in Diversity.

Table 42

Social Distance and the Desirability of Group Differences

Subjects	Social Distance from Other Ashkenazic Groups	Orientals	Other Oriental Groups	Europeans (Ashkenazim)
	- and Desirability of Group Differences -			
European Pupils	.48*	.32		
European Parents	.61*	.63*		
Oriental Pupils			.20	.17
Oriental Parents			.00	.00

IV CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter the main conclusions from the findings of the study will be summarized.

a. "Europeans" and "Orientals." Is the division of the Jewish population into these two main ethnic groupings justified? Each contains within itself further subgroupings different in many respects, but this does not detract from the usefulness of the division. Tables 19, 22, and 36 reinforce the contention that the division into broad classes of ethnic groupings serves the analysis of problems connected with ethnic identity and inter-ethnic relations.

b. Ethnic hierarchy. In Israel there is a clear and unambiguous hierarchy of ethnic groupings: Jews of European stock (Ashkenazim) form a dominant group; Jews of Oriental (Asian-African) stock, a second less favorably evaluated group; and members of non-Jewish minorities, a least favored group.

There are subsidiary hierarchies within each of these major groupings which does not, however, change the broader order. No Oriental subgroup, for example, appears to be favored above any European one. Druzes, who are most highly evaluated among minority groups,are yet below the status of Moroccan Jews who are at the bottom rung of the Jewish ladder. These findings find support in Tables 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 22.

c. Prejudice is generalized. Our findings lend further support to the results of the many studies that have found prejudice to be a generalized personal tendency; individuals who have reservations about some one ethnic group tend to have reservations about others as well. This conclusion may here be reached on both the evidence of social distance and ethnic evaluation (Tables 15, 22).

d. Preferred Methods of Group integration. There are no differences in opinion among respondents about the desirability of group integration (Table 23), and it seems that Orientals in our sample are as interested in it as Europeans. We found less agreement on the ways and means to achieve integration. About half favor group and half individual action. As was predictable, Orientals are more inclined toward group action.

e. Structure of ethnic identification. We attempted to study identification not as a one-dimensional variable but as a system of orientations toward the ethnic group composed of several components. The components we investigated are centrality, solidarity, and valence, but other components are likely.

We found differences between the structure of ethnic identification among members of the dominant and low-status ethnic groups. The structure of Europeans is well integrated with centrality, solidarity, and valence forming a unified whole. That of the Orientals is weaker mainly because of the lack of association of valence with centrality and solidarity (Table 34). The reason for the low correlation of valence with the other aspects of identification among Orientals may be sought in the relatively low status of that group. When group membership is not a privilege there is no reason why it should be attractive.

f. Relations among the variables. The variables that were investigated can be placed into three categories: 1) Antecedents: Age, Sex, Length of stay in country, etc. 2) Mediators: Perceived acceptance and mobility. 3) Outcomes: Social Distance, Evaluations, Ethnic identification, and others. With this division of variables in mind we shall present the main relations we found:

Length of stay in country and ethnic identification. The "optimistic" point of view on the ethnic problem in Israel regards it as a temporary phenomenon, the result of immigration, and likely to give way to full integration. Our study gave support to the prevalence of this view; the longer people have lived in the country the less central the problem becomes to them and the less solidarity they feel with members of their ethnic group. (Table 37)

Social mobility and ethnic identification. The subsample of parents provides, in spite of its small size, one of the important conclusions. One of the main mechanisms that may account for the tie between lack of upward mobility and ethnic identification is frustration. People whose strivings in the wider society are thwarted fall back on identification with their narrower group and advocate group action as a means for integration (p.212)

Religious observance and ethnicity. We found a number of relations between the extent of religious observance and a variety of ethnic attitudes (i. e. centrality, social distance, the desire to maintain certain differences between groups). These results are perhaps best explained by the conservative tendencies of the religious person. In Israel this tendency finds expression in a continuous and positive time perspective including elements of tradition that arose in the diaspora. These elements contain differences associated with local customs of the various ethnic groups; the religiously inclined will want to preserve these, too.

Finally, we may note that certain attitudes are tied into a system and may be singled out as "ethnic" attitudes. Such ethnic attitudes are the desire to be separatist (maintain social distance), to choose group problems by collectivist group action (organize the group to obtain what is coming), and to oppose the complete disappearance of differences between groups.

Notes

1) Erikson, E.H., 1966

2) Miller, D., 1963, pp. 639-738.

3) Murphy, 1947,defines the self in a small sentence: "The self is the individual as known to the individual."

4) A parallel construct was developed by Goffman and called the Presented Self. See Goffman, E., 1958.

5) Role theory is widely described in every sociology and social psychology text. One of the first to have used the term of role in systematic and clear fashion was Linton in his Study of Man, 1936.

6) Faris goes farther and asks whether in view of the many independent roles there is any point in talking about the personality as one unity. See Faris, 1962, p. 30.

7) Merton, R.K., 1957, pp. 369-70. Goffman, E. 1958.

8) Lewin, K., 1951, p. 117.

9) Merton, R.K., 1957, pp. 283-1. Hyman, H.H., 1942.

10) The program was written by J. Rosen and S. Elinav.

11) Thanks are extended to Mr. A. Winokur who called my attention to the virtues of the gamma coefficient. See Goodman, L.A. and Kruksal, W.H., 1954.

12) Conster, H.L., 1965.

13) Bogardus, E.S., LXII, pp. 165-75. Bogardus, E.S., 1936, 90-103.

14) Guttman, L., 1944, p. 139.

15) Ibid.

16) For similar asymmetry in "Hometown," see Williams, R. M. Jr., 1964, p. 146.

17) Peres, Y. and Levi, Z., 28.

18) The Druzes are a non Moslem sect. Regions of residence are Southern Syria, Lebanon, and Israel. Their language and general way of life are Arabic.

19) Adorno, T.W., et al., 1950, p. 122. Allport, G.W., 1954, p. 68. Hartley, E.L., 1946. For a completely different viewpoint, see Faris, R.E.L., in Sherif, M. (ed.), 1962.

20) Osgood, C.F., Suci, G.J., and Tannenbaum, P.H., 1957, pp. 1-188.

21) Ibid., pp. 50-51.

22) Note the summary of Sherif and Sherif:

> The social distance scales of minority ethnic group members in the U.S. are on the whole strikingly similar to those of majority group members. There is one important difference. The minority group in the U.S. retains the established scale but moves his own group from its lower position up to or near the top of the scale. Sherif, M. and C.W., 1953, p. 81.

23) Weingrod, A., 1965, pp. 23-32; Frankenstein, K., 1953, pp. 17-24.

24) Newcomb, T.M., Turner, R.H., Converse, P.E., 1965, pp. 58-9.

25) Lewin, K., 1951, pp. 145-48.

26) Sherif, M. and C.W., 1953, Ch. 10; Stouffer, S.A., et al., 1949; Coser, L.A., 1956, p. 88.

27) Because of high correlations between cognitive and behavioral solidarity the two have at times been combined into a single scale.

28) Compare concept of Looking Glass Self. Cooley, C.H., 1922, pp. 180-190; also, Goffman, E., 1958, pp. 155-156.

Bibliography

Adorno, J.W. et al - *The Authoritarian Personality* Harper & Brothers, N. Y. 1950

Allport, W.G. - *The Nature of Prejudice,* The Bacon Press, Boston, Massachusetts, 1954

Bettelheim B., Janowitz, M. - *Social Change and Prejudice,* The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1964

Conster, H. L. - "Criteria for Measures of Association" in *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 30, No. 3, 1965, pp. 341-352.

Cooley, C.H., - *Human Nature and the Social Order,* N.Y. Scribner, 1922

Coser, L.A., - *The Function of Social Conflicts,* Glencoe, Ill. The Free Press, 1956.

Eisenstadt, S.N. - *The Absorption of Immigrants,* Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1954

Erikson, E.H. - "The Concept of Identity in Race Relations" in *Daedalus,* Vol. 59, No. 1, Winter 1966

Faris, R.E.L. - "Interaction Levels and Intergroup Relations" in, Sherif, M. (ed.) *Intergroup Relations and Leadership,* J. Wiley, N.Y. 1962

Frankenstein, K. - *Between Past and Future,* The H. Szold Foundation, Jerusalem, 1953.

Goffman, E. - *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* - University of Edinburgh, 1958

Goodman, L.A., Kruskal, W.H. - "Measures of Association for Gross Classifications" in *Journal of American Statistical Association,* Vol. 49, 1954, pp. 732-764.

Guttman, L., - "An Outline of the Statistical Theory of Prediction", in Horst, P. The Prediction of Personal Adjustment Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 48, N.Y. 1941.

Guttman, L., - "A Basis for Scaling Qualitative Data", in A.S.R. 1944.

Hartley, E.L. - Problems in Prejudice - Kings Crown Press, N.Y. 1946.

Hyman, H.H., - "The Psychology of Status" in, Archives of Psychology, No. 269, 1942

Lewin, K., - Field Theory in Social Science, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951

Lewin, K. - Resolving Social Conflicts, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948

Merton, R.K. - Social Theory and Social Structure, The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill. 1957

Miller, D., - "The Study of Social Relationships, Situation, Identity and Social Interaction", in: Koch, S. (ed.) Psychology, A Study of A Science, N.Y. 1963 Vol. 5, pp. 639-738

Murphy, G. - Personality: A Biosocial approach to Origins and Structure. Harper & Row, New York, 1947

Myrdal, G. - An American Dilemma. The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy. Harper & Brothers, N.Y. 1954

Newcomb, T.M., Turner, R.H., Convers, P.E. - Social Psychology Holt, Reinhart and Winston, N.Y. 1965

Peres, Y., and Levy, Z., "Jews and Arabs as seen by each other" (unpub. mss.)

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., Tannenbaum, P.H. - The Measurement of Meaning. University of Illinois Press, Urbana 1957

Sherif, M., and Sherif, C.W., - Groups in Harmony and Tension, Harper, N.Y. 1953.

Stouffer, S.A., et. al. The American Soldier - Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, Princeton University Press, 1949.

Weingrod, A. - Israel Group Relations in a New Society, Paul Mall Press, London, 1965

Williams, R. M. Jr. - Strangers Next Door, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1964.